THE EISENHOWER LIBRARY
3 1151 02722 6509

61546

Library
of the
Johns Hopkins University

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY · BALTIMORE · 1876
VERITAS VOS LIBERABIT

The Treatment of Philosophy and Philosophers by the Greek Comic Poets.

By W. R. Gray.

A Dissertation Presented to the Board of University Studies of the Johns Hopkins University for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Baltimore.

1893.

6152-6

The following are the principal works used in preparing this dissertation

1 Ritter and Preller. Historia Philosophiae Graecae, ed 7. Gothae, 1888.

2 Zeller, Ed. Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer Geschichtlen Entwicklung. vol I ed. 4, Leipzig 1876.

3 Zeller. Ed. Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy, translated by Sarah F. Alleyne and Evelyn Abbott. New York, 1886.

4 Lorenz. A. O. F. Leben und Schriften des Koers Epicharmus. Berlin, 1864.

5. Ahrens, H. L. De Dialecto Dorica p. 435 foll (fragments of Epicharmus works) Gottingae 1843.

6 Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta, ed Th. Kock. 3 vols, Leipzig 1880-88.

7 Fragmenta Comicorum Graecorum ed. Aug. Meineke, ed minor Berlin 1847.

8 Bergk, Th. Commentationum de Reliquiis Comoediae Atticae Antiquae Libri Duo, Leipzig, 1838.

9 Diogenis Laertii, ed Hübner, 2 vols, Leipzig 1828-31.

10 Athenaeus, ed Kaibel, 3 vols, Leipzig 1887-90.

11 Denis, J. La Comédie Grecque, vol. II Paris 1886.

Comedy and Philosophy in Sicily

In beginning a study of the treatment of philosophy and philosophers by the Greek comic poets it is not necessary to go back to the earliest stages of Greek comedy and attempt to follow it in its development from the rude Megaric farce until it reached the state of perfection in which we find it in the time of Aristophanes. It will be sufficient if we go back to the time when we first find it in a formulated state, when it seemed to have lost almost all kinship with the rude forms from which it was developed and was recognized and cultivated as a branch of literature. But it is not to Attica that we must look to find comedy in the early part of the fifth century B.C. as something more than the farces of Megarian youths or the loosely connected scenes of a Susarion. For this we must go

to Sicily. The period that we have to consider is the period in which fall the brilliant reigns of Gelon and Hieron. At this time Athens had not reached the height of her greatness, but in power as well as in culture and in the encouragement given to literature and art Syracuse had become the first of Grecian cities. It was here that Simonides, Bacchylides, Aeschylus and Pindar, attracted by the fame of the latter of these two rulers came to add to the splendor of the already famous court. It was here that Pindar composed odes in honor of the victories of Hieron and Chromius, or again to console Hieron when prostrated by a severe illness; here Aeschylus wrote and put on the stage some of his tragedies, and here the only Sicilian comic poets of this period, Epicharmus, Phormis, and Deinolochus labored and wrote.

In Epicharmus we have, if not the creator of comedy, the first great comic poet that Sicily produced, and in him we find what half a century later in Athens

would have been almost an impossibility — a comic poet and a philosopher in the same person. As such he was recognized in antiquity. Plato in the Theaetetus 152 E, speaks of him as ὁ ἄκρος τῆς κωμῳδίας and he speaks also of his philosophical views. Diogenes Laertius VIII 31 says that he was a disciple of Pythagoras, and classes him with the philosophers; and in III 12 he calls him a comic poet. Ennius entitled "Epicharmus" the poem in which he set forth doctrines of a Pythagorean stamp. Iamblichus (V.P. XXXVI 266) and Plutarch (Numa VIII) mention him as a Pythagorean, and in fact when he is mentioned as belonging to any school it is invariably the Pythagorean. But whether he can be put with a definite school is somewhat doubtful, for his fragments do not show a slavish adherence to any philosophical system. In some cases he seems to have been an independent thinker, here he shows kinship with Heracleitus, here with Pythagoras and here perhaps with Xenophanes. But there can be no doubt that he was more deeply influenced by the philosophy of Pythagoras

than by that of either Heraclitus or Xenophanes, and if we observe the progress that philosophy had made at this time in Italy and Sicily we are not surprised at this.

When Epicharmus came from Megara in Sicily to Syracuse in 483 B.C. the latest date at which he could have come the doctrines of Pythagoras had been known in Italy and perhaps in Sicily for nearly fifty years. Pythagoras was dead but the association which he had founded in Lower Italy lived on for near half a century. The man who had worked a revolution in restoring law and order in Crotona and whose fame had spread over all Lower Italy could not have remained unknown in the neighboring island of Sicily. (Athenaeus 32) tells us that Empedocles of Agrigentum, the grandfather of Empedocles the philosopher and a man of some note was a Pythagorean.[2] From Diogenes Laertius (VIII 7) it is probable that there was some intimacy between Pythagoras and Helothales the father of Epicharmus, though Diogenes tells us nothing more than that according to Heraclides Pythagoras entitled one of his

1) Porphyry V.P. 22 2) Cf. also Diog. Laert. VIII 51

books "Iuotiaï." But with the exception of Empedocles of Agrigentum and Epicharmus we know the names of no disciples of Pythagoras from Sicily that can be referred to this period. We are told however, that Pythagoras visited several Sicilian cities[1] and that the people of Himera, Agrigentum, and Tauromenium on becoming imbued with his doctrines overthrew the tyrants ruling in these cities[2], and that Pythagoras himself joined the people of Agrigentum in a war against Syracuse.[3] Porphyry in his life of Pythagoras (27) speaks of his miraculous appearance on the same day to to his followers in Metapontum in Italy and in Tauromenium in Sicily. Probably little weight can be attached to any of these reports but they doubtless serve to show that Pythagoras stood in close relations with the Sicilian as well as with the Italian Greeks.

We find that Xenophanes after coming to Magna Graecia spent part of his time in Sicily. He is said to have lived in Catana and in Zancle (Diog. Laert. IX 18), and later in life we find him at the court of Syracuse where as in other

[1] A. Lijsar, De Doriensium Comoedia Quaestiones p. 92 foll. Lorenz p. 49. [2] Porph. v. P. 21. [3] Diog. Laert. VIII 40

places he must have recited his poems expressing his philosophy of the universe. Here too he found a field for philosophical investigations, for in the impressions of fish and other marine animals found in the rock quarries of Syracuse he saw interesting proofs of his theory that the world had once been dissolved in water. (Orig. Phil. 24) But the wandering life that he led gave birth to no philosophical school in Sicily; in fact there seem to have been no philosophical schools, no Pythagorean associations in existence here at this time.

Empedocles of Agrigentum did not begin his career as a philosopher until later, but the forces were doubtless at work which shaped his course. The position and influence of Empedocles must have imparted dignity to the name philosopher, and when the time of his activity falls after that of Epicharmus his popularity may contribute something towards showing that philosophy was not regarded with the

same distance at this time in Sicily as in Athens in the latter part of the same century. We know that Hieron tolerated Xenophanes, perhaps the most outspoken of philosophers, with his monotheism and his ridicule of Homer. We hear however that he rebuked him for the latter. Plutarch (Apophth. reg. et imp. 175 C) says that on one occasion Xenophanes complained to Hieron that he was so poor that he could scarcely support two servants. Hieron replied, "But Homer whom you ridicule supports though dead more than ten thousand." If this shows anything as to the liberty allowed Xenophanes it more probably shows that he stood in no fear of Hieron and that he was allowed to teach his philosophy unmolested than that he met with decided opposition.

This short summary does not show that philosophy was at this time widely known in Sicily but it is sufficient to show that the doctrines of Pythagoras and Xenophanes could not have been unknown in

the sphere of Epicharmus activity. It may be seen to show that when political freedom had come to an end in Syracuse there was still room for free thinking. We see there no opposition to those who departed from established and national beliefs. Not even the sophistic Simonides, "the first poet who wrote for gold" and thereby degraded his sacred calling to that of a mere money-maker's seems to have received any censure. The struggle between science and religion which we find going on in Athens in the time of Old Comedy, had not yet begun, and when it did begin it did not begin in Sicily.

We can see how it was possible under these circumstances for Epicharmus to assume the role both of a comic poet and of a philosopher and yet make a success. There seem to be no grounds for the statement of Iamblichus V.P. XXXVI 266 that Epicharmus owing to his fear of Hieron refrained from engaging in philosophical teaching openly but expressed the conceptions of Pythagoreanism in the form

of comedies. From the progress that philosophy must have made in Sicily at this time it is impossible that Epicharmus while giving utterance in his comedies to sayings which smacked of the doctrines of Pythagoras and Xenophanes could have escaped detection. But there was no cause for such concealment. From the anecdotes told by Plutarch about Epicharmus and Hieron,[1] we infer that Epicharmus stood in no great terror of the tyrant. Xenophanes did not find it necessary to conceal his philosophy under the garb of comedy, or in any other way, and why should Epicharmus? The man who could tolerate the teaching of Eleatic philosophy would hardly have found the Pythagorean more offensive. Hieron was anxious to make his court famous for the variety and eminence of the literary men assembled there and the presence of the greatest comic poet then living could have been regarded as no small addition. We may safely conclude that Epicharmus stood in great favor with Hieron as well as with the people

[1] Apophth. reg. et imp. 175 C. Quomodo adul. ab amico internoscatur [illegible].

people of Syracuse.

With Phormis and Deinolochus we have nothing to do in considering the relations between the comic poets and the philosophers. Very little has been left us in reference to their lives and we have nothing left from their works from which we can form any conception of their attitude towards the philosophers. We have seen that philosophy was not opposed at this time by the state and the age in which Phormis and Deinolochus lived was characterized by greater freedom of thought or by greater indifference to new doctrines than the age to which Old and Middle Comedy belong. We hear nothing of the hostility of these two poets to Epicharmus - nothing more than that Deinolochus was a rival of Epicharmus - and it is not likely that they made any attacks in which either Epicharmus or Xenophanes, the protégés of Hieron were assailed.

I shall now consider some fragments from the works of Epicharmus which show his philosophical leaning. One of his sayings that seems to have been very familiar in antiquity and was perhaps quoted oftener than almost any other is the following (Ahrens fr. 117)[1].

νόος ὁρῇ καὶ νόος ἀκούει· τἆλλα κωφὰ καὶ τυφλά.

Grysar (p. 13) takes this as nearly identical with a verse from Xenophanes,

οὖλος ὁρᾷ, οὖλος δὲ νοεῖ, οὖλος δέ τ' ἀκούει,

but there is a wide difference between the two. The latter part of the verse from Epicharmus τἆλλα κωφὰ καὶ τυφλά excludes all kinship with that from Xenophanes, and Welcker[2] supposes that Epicharmus speaks out here in direct opposition to Eleatic pantheism. But however this may be there can be little doubt that in this verse he gave expression to a Pythagorean dogma which distinguished between the creative cause and dead matter. If we conclude with Zeller (I 333 foll.) that this doctrine did not belong to the original stock

1) See Lorenz p. 255 n. 2 2) Kleine Schriften I 353

of Pythagorean philosophy, but that Anaxagoras was the first to teach it (Arist. Met. 3, 984.13) then we must regard this theory as an independent production of the Sicilian poet, and whether he taught it or not he gave utterance to it before it was taught by Anaxagoras.

The following is another fragment which seems to show a Pythagorean coloring (Athenaeus, 96)

Εὔμαιε, τὸ σοφόν ἐστιν οὐ καθ' ἓν μόνον,
ἀλλ' ὅσσα περ ζῆ πάντα καὶ γνώμαν ἔχει,
καὶ γὰρ τὸ θῆλυ τᾶν ἀλεκτορίδων γένος,
αἰ λῇς καταμαθεῖν ἀτενές, οὐ τίκτει τέκνα
ζῶντ', ἀλλ' ἐπῴζει καὶ ποιεῖ ψυχὰν ἔχειν.
τὸ δὲ σοφὸν ἁ φύσις τόδ' οἶδεν ὡς ἔχει
μόνα· πεπαίδευται γὰρ αὐταύτας ὕπο

Even Lorenz who sees in the other fragments from the comedies of Epicharmus nothing more than comic sport cannot deny that in this one there is something more. He thinks that the poet gives expression here to the Pythagorean doctrine of the soul of the world, ...

divine breath which extends throughout all nature and manifests itself in the instinct of the brute as well as in the intelligence of man. But I think that it is hardly necessary to conclude with Lorenz that this fragment is from a play containing eight philosophical discussions and composed for a select and cultured circle of hearers in Syracuse. Other fragments that should be placed with the two just given have been preserved for us by Clemens Alexandrinus and Plutarch, but I quote them from Ahrens.

In fragment 151 we have,

καθαρὸν αἴκα νόον ἔχῃς, ἅπαν τὸ σῶμ' ἐσσὶ καθαρός.

In fragment 146,

εὐσεβὴς νόῳ πεφυκὼς οὐ πάθοις κ' οὐδὲν κακὸν

κατθανών· ἄνω τὸ πνεῦμα διαμενεῖ κατ' οὐρανόν.

Again in 152

εὐσεβὴς βίος μέγιστον ἐφόδιον θνατοῖς ἔπι.

In 126

συνεκρίθη καὶ διεκρίθη κἀπῆλθεν ὅθεν ἦλθεν πάλιν

γᾶ μὲν εἰς γᾶν, πνεῦμα δ' ἄνω· τί τῶνδε χαλεπόν; οὐδὲ ἕν.

Finally in fragment 14[1]

οὐδὲν ἐκφεύγει τὸ θεῖον· τοῦτο γιγνώσκειν τυ δεῖ·

αὐτός ἐσθ' ἁμῶν ἐπόπτας, ἀδυνατεῖ δ' οὐδὲν θεός.

Nothing could bear more clearly than these fragments the stamp of Pythagoreanism in accordance with which purity and piety in life insured a happy lot after death, but an impure life brought punishment, the soul at death returning to the air or being imbod[illegible] ones according as the life had been pure or impure. Another fragment (Athen. 771) shows some kinship with a fragment from Xenophanes.

θαυμαστὸν οὐδὲν ἁμὲ ταῦθ' οὕτω λέγειν

καὶ ἁνδάνειν αὐτοῖσιν αὐτοὺς καὶ δοκεῖν

καλῶς πεφύκειν· καὶ γὰρ ἁ κύων κυνὶ

κάλλιστον εἶμεν φαίνεται, καὶ βοῦς βοΐ,

ὄνος δ' ὄνῳ κάλλιστον [ἐστίν], ὗς δ' ὑΐ.

In the fragment from Xenophanes (Clem. Alex. Str. I 715?), we have

ἀλλ' εἴ τοι χεῖρας γ' εἶχον βόες ἠὲ λέοντες

[1] See Diog. Laert. VIII ?, [illegible] 71

καὶ γράψαι χείρεσσι καὶ ἔργα τελεῖν ἅπερ ἄνδρες
ἵπποι μέν θ' ἵπποισι, βόες δέ τε βουσὶν ὁμοίας
καί κε θεῶν ἰδέας ἔγραφον καὶ σώματ' ἐποίουν
τοιαῦθ' οἷόν περ καὐτοὶ δέμας εἶχον ὁμοῖον.

Clemens Alexandrinus (Str. VII 841 P.) represents Xenophanes as saying almost the same the same thing with regard to the different races of men, that each race reprepresents the god like in form to the members belonging to his race, the Ethiopean black and flat-nosed, the Thracian red-haired and blue-eyed. There is a close resemblance between these two fragments, but Lorenz thinks that the fragment from Epicharmus is of such a comic tone that no importance whatever can be attached to the thought expressed in it. There may be a comic vein running through it, but I do not think that we can conclude even in that case that the poet is here ridiculing the doctrine of Xenophanes, or that there is no kinship between the two fragments. Epicharmus may have had little sympathy with the doctrine of Eleatic pantheism, but there was nothing

in Xenophanes statements in reference to the various forms in which the gods were represented that he could not accept, and it seems safe to conclude that he did accept this part of Xenophanes teaching and soon gave utterance to it in one of his comedies. The following fragment (Ahrens 95) preserved for us by Diogenes Laertius (III 14) was taken from the writings of Alcimus who quoted it to show that the germ of Plato's doctrine of ideas was to be found in Epicharmus. The dialectical method pursued here is very much like that followed by Plato and it serves to show something of the philosophical mind of the poet, but whether Plato made use of Epicharmus to get new ideas in this line cannot be known and it does not concern us here.

Α. ἆρ' ἔστιν αὔλησίς τι πρᾶγμα; Β. πάνυ μὲν ὦν.
Α. ἄνθρωπος ὦν αὔλησίς ἐστιν; Β. οὐθαμῶς.
Α. φέρ' ἴδω, τί δ' αὐλητάς; τίς εἶμέν τοι δοκεῖ;
ἄνθρωπος; ἢ οὐ γάρ; Β. πάνυ μὲν ὦν. Α. οὐκ ὦν δοκεῖ
οὕτως ἔχειν [τοι] καὶ περὶ τὠγαθοῦ; τό γα

ἀγαθόν τι πρᾶγμ' ἦμεν καθ' αὗθ'· ὅστις δέ κα
εἰδῇ μαθὼν τῆν', ἀγαθὸς ἤδη γίνεται
ὥσπερ γὰρ αἴκ' αὔλησιν αὐλητὰς μαθὼν
ἢ ὄρχησιν ὀρχηστάς τις ἢ πλοκεὺς πλοκάν
ἢ πάν γ' ὁμοίως τῶν τοιούτων, ὅ,τι τὺ λῇς,
οὐκ αὐτὸς εἴη κ' ἁ τέχνα τεχνικός γα μάν.

Diogenes Laertius has preserved us another fragment (Ahrens 94) but this reflects the philosophy of Heraclitus.

Α. ἀλλ' ἀεὶ τοὶ θεοὶ παρῆσαν χὐπέλιπον οὐπώποκα·
τάδε δ' ἀεὶ πάρεσθ' ὅμοια διά τε τῶν αὐτῶν ἀεί.
Β. ἀλλὰ λέγεται μὰν Χάος πρᾶτον γενέσθαι τῶν θεῶν.
Α. πῶς δέ; ἀμάχανόν γ' ἀπό τινος ἦμεν ὅ,τι πρᾶτον μόλοι.
Β. οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμολε πρᾶτον οὐδέν; Α. οὐδὲ μὰ Δία δεύτερον
τῶνδέ γ' ὧν ἁμὲς νῦν ὧδε λέγομες, ἀλλὰ τάδε ἦς
αἰ ποτ' ἀριθμόν τις περισσόν, αἰ δὲ λῇς τὸν ἄρτιον
ποτθέμειν λῇ ψᾶφον ἢ καὶ τᾶν ὑπαρχουσᾶν λαβεῖν
ἦ δοκεῖ κά τοι γ' ὡυτὸς εἶμεν; Β. οὐκ ἐμὶν τάχα.
Α. οὐδὲ μὰν οὐδ' αἰ ποτὶ μέτρον παχυαῖον ποτθέμειν
λῇ τις ἅτερον μᾶκος ἢ τοῦ πρόσθ' ἐόντος ἀποταμεῖν

ἔτι χ' ὑπάρχοι κεῖνο τὸ μέτρον; Β. οὐ γάρ. Α. ὧδε νῦν ὅρη
καὶ τὼς ἀνθρώπους· ὁ μὲν γὰρ αὔξεθ', ὁ δέ γα μὰν φθίνει,
ἐν μεταλλαγᾷ δὲ πάντες ἐντὶ πάντα τὸν χρόνον.
ὃ δὲ μεταλλάσσει κατὰ φύσιν κοὔποκ' ἐν τωὐτῷ μένει,
ἕτερον εἴη κα τόδ' ἤδη τοῦ παρεξεστακότος.
καὶ τυ δὴ κἠγὼ χθὲς ἄλλοι καὶ νῦν ἄλλοι τελέθομες
καὖθις ἄλλοι κοὔποχ' ὡυτοὶ [τελέθομες] καττὸν λόγον.

The fragments preserved by Clemens Alexandrinus and Plutarch were probably taken from a didactic poem περὶ φύσεως which Epicharmus is supposed to have written. Diogenes Laertius (VIII 78) says of him that he left writings in which he discoursed on nature, and Ennius, as we have seen entitled "Epicharmus" the didactic poem in which he set forth Pythagorean doctrines. Ennius wrote this in trochaic tetrameter and it is probable that he found both the form and the substance of his poem in a work

---

In l. [illegible] I have adopted Hermann's reading in Diog. Laert (Huebner), and in l. 8 τῶν ὑπαρχόντων (Hermann and Cobet). In l. 9 I have followed Cobet in reading ὡυτός and in l. 16 in reading κα τόδ' ἤδη. In 18 I follow Lorenz in the emendation ὡυτοί.

of the same kind by Epicharmus. Lorenz, p. 165, points out the fact that while no philosophers of this period used trochaic tetrameter for a didactic poem, yet it had been used by Archilochus in works of an erotic, parainetic, and satirical nature, and by Solon in poems in which he defended himself against the attacks of his enemies. He thinks therefore that Epicharmus, who had a decided preference for this verse very probably departed from the customary usage and introduced it into didactic poetry. "But whatever may have been the nature of the poem or poems from which the fragments preserved by Clemens Alexandrinus and Plutarch were taken, it is very probable that those preserved by Diogenes Laertius, frs 94, 95, 96, and 97 Ahrens, were taken from comedies. Both the dialogue which occurs in these fragments and the meter (iambic trimeter) of three of them exclude the supposition that they were taken from a didactic poem."[1]

Alcimus quoted the last fragment in support of his view that Plato got his doctrine of the flux of all objects of

[1] See Lorenz p. 100

derivation from Epicharmus. Whether we agree with Alcimus or with Lorenz (p. 116) who sees in this as well as in the preceding fragment only a piece of dialectical sport and refers to it the λόγος αὐξανόμενος so often used by the sophists and attributed by Plutarch (adv. Stoic. de comm. nott. 1083) to Epicharmus, we cannot deny that we have here the Heraclitean doctrine of the constant flux of all things. Plato in the Theaetetus (152 E) in speaking of this doctrine says that it was held by Pythagoras, Heraclitus, Empedocles, Epicharmus, and Homer. Whether Plato had in mind this passage from Epicharmus when he wrote the Theaetetus, or whether Alcimus had in mind the passage from the Theaetetus when he quoted the fragment from Epicharmus makes little difference. Plato gives this as the doctrine of Epicharmus and there can be little doubt that he was well informed on the subject. There is no reason for supposing that Epicharmus is here ridiculing the doctrine of Heraclitus. The tone is not that of ridicule, and the fact that it occurs

in a comedy, especially in a comedy of this period gives no ground for such a suspicion.

These fragments from the comedies of Epicharmus, touching on philosophy as they do, show that he did not confine himself exclusively to the Pythagorean school, but that he studied other systems as well; and that while following his profession as a comic poet he gave expression here and there to sayings - whether put in the form of dialogues or otherwise - which showed that he was deeply influenced by the philosophical speculations of his age. But I do not think that it is necessary to conclude that he designed to impart philosophical truths from these thoughts embodied in his comedies, for we have no evidence that he felt his mission to be that of a philosopher. He was first and foremost a comic poet. The testimony of antiquity and the fragments left from his poems unite in placing this beyond doubt. His great aim as a comic poet must have been to amuse his hearers, but despite this fact, if he was influenced by

philosophy his writings would show more or less his philosophical tendencies, and that, whether he wrote with this intention or not. This would be the necessary result of his studies in the schools of Pythagoras and others unless he had studiously excluded from his writings any expressions indicative of the impressions that he had received in these schools.

Nothing can be more striking than the difference between Epicharmus and the comic poets who came after him. They confined themselves mostly to the absurd side of life. Even in their attacks upon philosophy, they treated mostly of absurdities. If we judge of their knowledge of philosophy from their writings we conclude that they knew almost nothing about it, and it is not until we come to the very close of Greek comedy that we note a change in this respect. But the poet who "endued comedy with a plot and imparted unity to it" was also a philosopher. He did not confine himself merely to the absurd side of human nature but gave expression to his reflections on life"

"Jevons. Hist. Gk. Lit. p. 283

The Treatment of Philosophy in Old Comedy

Comedy in Sicily seems to have died with Epicharmus. There was no great poet to take his place and during the short reign of Thrasybulus and the supremacy of the democracy which followed, few inducements were offered to poets in Syracuse in comparison with the inducements offered during the reign of Hieron. It was during this time that oratory began to be recognized as an art and the literary talent of Syracuse as well as that of Leontini seems to have been exerted in this direction.

When the theater of comedy was transferred from Syracuse to Athens its surroundings were entirely altered. Epicharmus wrote his comedies to please the court of Syracuse and to add to the splendor of the already famous city. Politics were of course excluded and he was restricted largely to the reproduction of Sicilian character and life. In Athens the comic poets wrote to win popular applause and, as they said, to exercise a moral censorship. Then

was here no royal court and no restriction as to the subjects of which comedy might treat. In Sicily there was probably a leaning towards philosophy, but during the time of Old Comedy Greece was in the midst of the religious revival that sprang up after the Persian wars and while the Sicilians had appeared indifferent to the spread of new doctrines the Athenians were ready to oppose any departure from the religion of their fathers. After the reign of Hieron no inducements were offered to philosophers to go to Syracuse, except such as may have presented themselves to the wandering sophists, but the glory which the Athenians had gained by beating back the Persian invasions, the genius of such men as Themistocles and Pericles and the enthusiasm which pervaded the whole Athenian people had made Athens the first of Grecian cities. Here as nowhere else the sophists saw an inviting field and we find that Protagoras made this one of his principal lecturing points during the forty years that he travelled through Hellas. Here we find Gorgias of Leontini, Hippias of Elis

Prodicus of Ceos and Thrasymachus of Chalcedon. Anagoras the friend and probably teacher of Pericles made Athens his home for the thirty years following 462 B.C. Parmenides and Zeno the Eleatic seem to have spent some time here (Plat. Parm. 127 B) and it is during the time of Old Comedy that we find the atheistic philosopher Hippo here. In addition to these men Athens had a philosopher of her own. Besides the young men who were attached to Socrates each of these philosophers and sophists must have had a following, and if we add to these, philosophers of less importance who were probably in Athens but of whom no mention is made we see that here as nowhere else philosophical thought was exerting an influence. Such a state of things as we saw in Sicilian comedy - a comic poet and philosopher in one person - would have been almost an impossibility in Athens. The Attic comic poets were eager to gain popular applause and no one of them would have been willing to hazard his chance of success by assuming the role of a philosopher in addition to that of a comic poet. Comedy in Athens was a state institution

and the state was opposed to philosophy, at least to philosophy as taught by Hippo and Anaxagoras. How early the state took this stand against philosophy we do not know, but probably not before 432 B.C. when Anaxagoras was banished on a charge of Atheism, and it was probably not long afterwards when the same charge was brought against his disciple Diagoras.

Of the comic poets who preceded Cratinus and who controlled the stage in Athens shortly after the Persian wars we know very little. All that we have left of their works are a few lines and the titles of about a dozen plays. We have nothing to indicate that they were hostile to philosophy and it is not likely that the personal abuse that we find in every part of Old Comedy would have been tolerated before the democracy in the time of Pericles became thoroughly established. Again, in the early years of Old Comedy there seem to have been no philosophers in Athens. Anaxagoras did not settle there until about 462 B.C. and it must have been later than this when Parmenides

and even honored the Athenians with a visit, and still later when Protagoras began to lecture there. In the time of Cratinus we find Hippo in Athens - in fact we hardly find him anywhere else - but there seems to have been no philosopher who preceded Anaxagoras. It may therefore be safe to conclude that not before 450 B.C. perhaps not until later, did philosophy attract much attention in Athens.

The poet who first attacked philosophy from the stage and began the war upon the philosophers which lasted almost as long as Attic comedy itself was Cratinus. It would be interesting to know whether the popular outburst of indignation which resulted in the banishment of Anaxagoras was preceded and influenced by the attack of Cratinus upon Hippo or not, but as to this we can only conjecture. The date of the Panoptae in which he satirized Hippo is unknown. It is almost certain that it appeared before any of the extant plays of Aristophanes, for from argument I of the Clouds of Aristophanes we learn that the Flask, which seems to have been the last of Cratinus' comedies was

brought out in 423 B.C. at the same time with the Clouds. From the arguments to the Acharnians and Knights we learn that at the Lenaean festival in 424 B.C. Cratinus brought out the Cheimazomeni and in 425 B.C. he brought out the Satyrs, competing with Aristophanes each time. It is probable that the Panoptae belongs to the early part of his poetical career, possibly coming shortly after the Thracian Women. In the Thracian Women in which he attacked Pericles he probably took the initiative in political comedy and then his satire knew no bounds. He attacked everything that afforded material for comedy and it is not strange that he soon saw in the philosophers Hippo an object for satire. As we do not know during what part of Cratinus career Hippo was in Athens nor how long he lived there it may not be safe to conclude that the Panoptae appeared shortly after the Thracian Women, but from lines 1044-54 of the parabasis of the Wasps of Aristophanes it seems to have preceded the Clouds a considerable time. Aristophanes professes here to have given his spectators something

new in comedy when he brought out the Clouds and he could have made no such profession if the Panoptae of Cratinus had been fresh in the minds of the people.

From the few fragments left from the Panoptae it is impossible to form a clear notion of the manner in which Cratinus treated his subject. We do not know whether he attacked Anaxagoras and other philosophers who may have been in Athens, or whether he devoted the whole play to Hippo. Even of the treatment that Hippo received the fragments give us no clear notion as his name does not occur in them. We learn more from two scholia than from those fragments. One of these scholia is to line 96 of the Clouds of Aristophanes, and from it we learn that Cratinus ridiculed Hippo for teaching that the heavens were an oven, and that men were simply charcoal to be consumed in his oven. Aristophanes in line 96 of the Clouds represents Socrates as teaching the same thing. The scholiast to Clemens Alexandrinus Protrepticus 20) says that Cratinus charged Hippo with impiety but of Hippo's philosophy or of the extreme to which he went we know very little.

Aristotle, Met. I 3, places him in the same school with Thales, but says that he is not worthy to be compared with Thales in intellect, and Athenaeus (610b) calls him ἄθεος.

From the scholia referred to it appears that Hippo received nearly the same treatment that Socrates received in the Clouds, though we cannot tell definitely whether he was represented as professing to make the worse cause appear the better. The scholiast to the Clouds says that Hippo seems to have been satirized for this before Socrates, but he does not make a definite statement in reference to this feature of the criticism. The following fragment from the Panoptai (Kock I 61) was doubtless directed against the investigating spirit of philosophy which was not content with searching after the causes of natural phaenomena but was also attacking the national religion.

κρανία ὅσσα φορεῖν, ὧν ἐγκεφάλου δ' οὐκ ἀφθαρτεῖ.

Runkel, p. 51, thinks, and perhaps rightly, that the chorus from which the play took its name was composed of the disciples of Hippo, and he takes this fragment as referring to the

chorus. It is possible that it refers to the nature of Hippo and his discourses in philosophical investigations, but perhaps it is safer to conclude with Bergk that it refers to the actual appearance of the chorus on the stage.

In another fragment (Kock I 60) Hippo is probably accused of the love of boys.

μισῶν γὰρ τὰς γυναῖκας, πρὸς παιδικὰ δὴ τρέπῃ νῦν.

No mention is made of Hippo in connection with this verse, but from the evidence that we have it is improbable that it was directed against any one else than the philosopher or one of his associates. In another fragment (K. I 60) Hippo is probably compared or associated with a certain Aristodemus, a shameless fellow.

Ἀριστόδημος ὡς ἀσχημονῶν

ἐν τοῖς Κιμωνείοις ἀνὴρ ἐρανίοις[1]

Bergk (p. 183 foll.) discusses these fragments and says that Cratinus represented Hippo here as addicted to shameful lust.

[1] This is Bergk's emendation of a reference in the scholia to Lucian Alex. 4. Bergk would also read οὗτος ὁ before Ἀριστόδημος.

in order to show how far the pursuit of philosophy alienated men from honesty and piety. But from such fragments we cannot draw satisfactory conclusions, and even with the help of the scholiast mentioned we can form only an imperfect notion of the treatment that Hippo received.

This much however is clear, that just as Cratinus stands as the pioneer in political comedy, so he stands as the pioneer of the comic poets in their opposition to philosophy, and that the characteristics that he ridiculed in philosophy were similar in some respects at least to those ridiculed by Aristophanes in the Clouds. The Panoptae is not only the predecessor of the Clouds but very probably the model on which the Clouds was formed. If we knew the influence that the example set by Cratinus had in determining Aristophanes' attitude towards philosophy, if we knew the influence exerted by the state in this direction, we should doubtless see in him much less of the bold champion of conservatism, and more of an imitator of Cratinus and an attempt to keep in the wake of the popular feeling.

Of the two poets we should expect more violent opposition to philosophy from Cratinus, for he had lived through the Persian wars, through times when there were no philosophers in Greece, and he would naturally have been more hostile to the changes that he saw going on around him than Aristophanes who was born after philosophy had gained a foothold in Athens. But we have seen that the atheistic teachings of Anaxagoras and Diagoras met with decided opposition from the state, and how dangerous such teachings were regarded may be seen from the fact that in 411 B.C. when Protagoras[1] was banished from Athens his books were brought into the market place and publicly burned. Some features of sophistic teaching were odious to conservative Athenians, and then an orator like Euathlus[2] was supposed to have acquired his art and doubtless his character in the school of Protagoras, could not have added to the popularity of the wandering professor.

[1] Euseb. in Praep. Ev. XIV 19 [2] The scholiast to the Wasps 590 speaks of him as ῥήτωρ συκοφάντης, and ἔστι τις πονηρός and Ar. says about as much. In Bergk 97 to

It would therefore be unfair to conclude that the comic poets in arraying themselves on the popular side in opposition to philosophy were merely pandering to the popular feeling; for they were men, Athenian citizens and as such they were interested in the welfare of the state. But it would perhaps be far from true to conclude that they were always sincere in their attacks upon philosophy, and that they were never on the side of the people from mere policy. The state seems to have been opposed only to certain features of philosophic teaching, but the comic poets went far beyond the opposition of the state. In some cases they may have been sincere, they may have regarded philosophy as dangerous to the welfare of the state but too much stress has doubtless been laid on their moral censorship and patriotic spirit in their treatment of the philosophers. They professed to the correctors of abuses, and the guardians of the state, but we must grant that the desire to gain popular applause, to make the subject in hand ridiculous, and to raise a laugh, outweighed every other consideration, and that this together with

the facility with which the characteristics touched on could be turned into ridicule will account for much of the satire directed against the philosophers. Again, the comic poets had their personal enemies and among them possibly some of the philosophers. In the Clouds (296) Socrates is represented as speaking of the comic poets as a rather contemptible set, and Aelian (V.H. II 13) tells us that he went to the theater only when Euripides brought out a new play. Athenaeus 220a, says that most of the philosophers were rather abusive of the comic poets. Consequently the ill feeling between the two departments seems to have been mutual, and even if the theater was regarded among the Athenians as designed for the moral instruction and elevation of the people, this only gave the comic poets a better opportunity for abusing their personal enemies under the guise of zeal for the common good.

The liberty granted to the poets in the time of Old Comedy was simply boundless. No man was so insignificant, so retired, or so influential that he might not be dragged upon the stage to make sport for the people. How much the people themsel-

delighted in this personal abuse and how much they desired to be amused rather than to receive moral training may be seen from the fact that the law passed in 440 B.C. to restrict the license of comedy was repealed after three years[1] (We infer that not even Pericles who was doubtless influential in having the law passed was not able to withstand a demand for a restoration of the old order of things. The comic poets probably did much to bring about the repeal of this law, and we may conclude that their plays during this period of restriction were lacking in their former interest. There was however ample room for making comedy instructive without so much personal abuse.)

Aristophanes stands, whether justly or not as the principal character in Old Comedy in its opposition to philosophy. When he brought out the Clouds he had before him the example of Cratinus in his attack upon Hippo and he knew the attitude of the state toward such philosophers as Anaxagoras and Diagoras, for Anaxagoras had been banished and it is probable that the decree which offered a talent to any one who should kill

[1] Scholia to Acharnians 67.

Diagoras, had already been passed. Protagoras seems to have been lecturing somewhere else as we learn from Athenaeus (218 c) that Ameipsias did not introduce him among the chorus of philosophers in the Connus which appeared (arg. 7 to Clouds) at the same time with the Clouds of Aristophanes. If Diagoras had been outlawed and, as Athenaeus thinks, Protagoras was teaching in another city Socrates was the principal philosopher and the only one of any importance in Athens at this time. Before Aristophanes made an attack upon the philosophers he had written mostly political comedies, and from what he tells us in the parabasis of the Wasps (l. 1044 ff.) we conclude that he decided to give the people something new when he brought out the Clouds. He had decided to change the subject of his comedies and ridicule philosophy. He wanted a representative philosopher and there was no one else in Athens who suited his purpose so well as Socrates. While it is not impossible that Aristophanes was actuated by other motives as well, I think from the light we have on the

subject that this comes nearer the truth than to regard him as a corrector of abuses and a bitter opponent of philosophy. I do not think that we can conclude that the Clouds reflects the philosophy of Socrates as Aristophanes saw it, unless we forget that the great aim of the comic poet was to amuse the people. Aristophanes recognized this fact himself and he doubtless acted in accordance with it, for he tells us in the parabasis of the Knights 525 that Magnes lost his popularity in his old age because he had ceased to be amusing.

The philosophers whom Aristophanes attacks in the person of Socrates are Hippo, Anaxagoras Diagoras and Protagoras, the only philosophers who had been prominent in Athens. In lines 94-97 of the Clouds Socrates is represented as teaching that the heavens are an oven and that men are simply charcoal to be consumed in this oven. This, as we have seen, is to be referred to the teachings of Hippo. Socrates is also represented here as taking money for his instruction,[1]

[1] Jevons: Hist Gk. Lit. 279

as teaching how to make the worse cause appear the better, charges that were brought against the sophists and especially against Protagoras.[1] In lines 248-253 he is represented as denying the existence of the gods and introducing new divinities, the Clouds. We recognize in this the teachings of Diagoras,[2] and in line 830 Socrates is called ὁ Μήλιος. In line 225 he is engaged in speculating about the sun, and in this we see the philosophy of Anaxagoras, who said that the sun was a red-hot mass of metal.[3] The only passage that bears any resemblance to the teaching of Socrates is in l. 227 foll. where Socrates gives as the reason for suspending himself in a basket, that he could not carry on his investigations properly if he did not suspend his mind and mix the subtile thought with the kindred air, that he must be out of reach of the influence of the earth inasmuch as it had a tendency to draw the moisture of the thought to itself. This bears some resemblance to

---

1) Arist. Rhet. II 24, 11, Gell. N. A. I 3, 7. 2) See Scholia to Ar. Frogs 320.
3) Sotion in Diog. Laert. II 12.

what Socrates is represented as saying in the Phaedo[?] in reference to the souls being hindered in its search for the truth by the body. But the passage in the Clouds is probably only the invention of Aristophanes.

Little importance can be attached to the absurd things that Socrates is represented as doing, for they were necessary to the success of the play. It may be question-ed whether Socrates himself attached much impor-tance to the whole play. But as Croiset (p 311) says his reference to it in the Apology shows that neither he nor the Athe-nians had forgotten it. He seems however to have attached more importance to the reports that his enemies had secretly circulated about him, reports told the judges when they were children and more likely to believe false representations and in consequence of which they had grown up with false notions about his teaching.

We know almost nothing of the relations between Aristophanes and Socrates in private life. The only

time that we know of their appearing together was in 416 B.C. seven years after the appearance of the Clouds. This was in the house of Agathon as Plato represents them in the Symposium. They do not seem to have been enemies, and the scholiast to the Clouds (l. 96) says that Aristophanes did not devote the play to Socrates because he hated him. But whether the scholiast had any authority for this statement we do not know, and it may not be safe to lay much stress on their friendly meeting as it appears in the Symposium.

Ameipsias, as has been mentioned, brought out the Connus at the same time that Aristophanes brought out the Clouds, and from Athenaeus (218 C) we infer that several philosophers, or disciples of a philosopher, were introduced in the play. From the fragments left we know only of Socrates, and it is probable that he and his disciples formed the group of investigators referred to by Athenaeus. That these two plays both ridiculing Socrates were brought out at the same time may seem to indicate that Socrates

or philosophy was attracting more than usual attention, but it probably has no more significance than that the unique character of Socrates presented a good subject for comedy, and that he was the principal philosopher in Athens at this time. The offence for which he was ridiculed in the fragment from the Connus was his idleness and indifference to personal comfort (K. I 672)

Σώκρατες ἀνδρῶν βέλτιστ' ὀλίγων, πολλῶν δὲ ματαιόταθ', ἥκεις

καὶ σὺ πρὸς ἡμᾶς; καρτερικός γ' εἶ. πόθεν ἄν σοι χλαῖνα γένοιτο;

B. τουτὶ τὸ κακὸν τῶν σκυτοτόμων κατ' ἐπήρειαν γεγένηται.

οὗτος μέντοι πεινῶν οὕτως οὐπώποτ' ἔτλη κολακεῦσαι.

Diogenes Laertius (II 27) says that Socrates was introduced here in the garb of a philosopher but he does not tell us what part he acted in the play, nor does Athenaeus (218 c) give us any information on this point, unless it is in his reference to a group of philosophers. It is probably however that Socrates was not ridiculed here on account of his philosophical views. His reference in the Apology to a comic poet indicates that Aristophanes stood alone

in making an attack upon his philosophy through the medium of comedy. Connus was the music teacher of Socrates and it is known that Socrates did not study music until late in life. Plato in the Euthydemus (272 C) represents him as saying that the boys who went to school with him jeered him and called Connus an old man's teacher. It must have been an amusing sight to see an old man trudging to school with a crowd of boys, and we may safely conclude that it was this side of Socrates' time that was ridiculed in this play. He seems to have been represented here, just as he appeared to the Athenians. The last verse of the fragment is quite different in tone from the ridicule to which he was subjected in the Clouds; it praises him in one respect, and we have no reason for doubting that it is genuine praise.

This play was awarded the second prize over the Clouds (arg. V) which was awarded the third. We know nothing of its artistic merits, but it was superior to the Clouds in at least one respect, it came nearer representing

Socrates as he was, and this may have been a point in its favor. The Athenians may have cared little about the injustice of such an attack as Aristophanes made upon Socrates, but it would doubtless be far from the truth to conclude that they were always unbiased in their decisions and decided from an artistic point of view alone. Whether the cold reception of the Clouds was due in any measure to the unfairness of the play or not, Aristophanes had overestimated the popular feeling against philosophy. He had been too zealous and he received a rebuke for it. That he felt this keenly can be seen from the parabasis of the Clouds as it now stands and also from the parabasis of the Wasps. But his remarks here show that his disappointment arose solely from the fact that he had not been awarded the first prize for a comedy that he regarded as his best work. In the parabasis of the Wasps (1047 sqq.) he tells the spectators that they had never heard better comic verses, and that he considered them clever enough to see the

merits of the play. He had given them something new and such a poet deserved to meet with success. But they have rejected him and given the first and second prizes to Cratinus and Ameipsias, vulgar fellows as he calls them (Clouds 520 foll.). He claims the first prize too for the service he had rendered the state in bringing out the Clouds (Wasps 1038 foll.) not because he had made thereby an attack upon such men as Socrates and the atheistic tendencies in philosophy, but because he had attacked the sophists and their trickery in speaking. This seems to be the meaning of his reference here to the service rendered in bringing out the Clouds. But what does this amount to when he is enumerating his own services to raise himself in the estimation of the people in the hope of receiving the prize for the play on exhibition, and when he seems to emphasize more than anything else the intrinsic merits of the Clouds. His censure does not sound much like that of a man who so mourned the fact that his countrymen were indifferent to the pernicious influences

of philosophy or who saw in it any dangerous tendencies himself. Probably we should expect from him only such censure as we find in the Wasps and in the Clouds, but if he was sincere in his attack upon Socrates and philosophy, it is not unreasonable to expect censure of a different tone.

Aristophanes and Ameipsias were not the only comic poets who ridiculed Socrates. In a fragment from an unknown comedy of Eupolis' (K. I 352) he is ridiculed for the same thing as in the fragment from the Connus of Ameipsias, but the tone is much more severe.

> μισῶ δὲ καὶ τὸν Σωκράτην τὸν πτωχὸν ἀδολέσχην,
> ὃς τἄλλα μὲν πεφρόντικεν,
> ὁπόθεν δὲ καταφαγεῖν ἔχοι τούτου κατημέληκεν.

In another fragment from an unknown play of Eupolis' (K. I 355) Socrates is represented as a thief.

> δεξάμενος δὲ Σωκράτης τὴν ἐπιδέξια
> Στησιχόρου πρὸς τὴν λύραν οἰνοχόην ἔκλεψεν.

There may be some kinship between these verses and the

passage in the Clouds (97) where he is represented as a clothes thief. From the scholiast to the Clouds (96) we infer that Eupolis did not mention Socrates often, for the scholiast says that Eupolis in the few words in which he mentions Socrates abused him more than Aristophanes did in the whole of the Clouds.

Another poet of this period who ridicules Socrates is Callias. In a fragment from the Prisoners (K I 696) he makes him responsible for the haughty bearing of a certain character.

A τί δὴ σὺ σεμνὴ καὶ φρονεῖς οὕτω μέγα;

B ἔξεστι γάρ μοι. Σωκράτης γὰρ αἴτιος.

Phrynichus composed a play called the Connus, but as we have only the title of the play left, we know nothing of its nature except so much as may be derived from the name and from the Connus of Ameipsias.

Two years after the appearance of the Clouds Eupolis brought out the Flatterers (Ath 218c) in which Protagoras and probably other sophists were ridiculed, but we have only one fragment of this nature (K I 297).

ἔνδον μέν ἐστι Πρωταγόρας ὁ Τήϊος
ὃς ἀλαζονεύεται μὲν ἀλιτήριος
περὶ τῶν μετεώρων, τὰ δὲ χαμᾶθεν ἐσθίει.

This bears some resemblance to the passage in the Clouds (95-97) in which Socrates and his disciples are first mentioned.

ἐνταῦθ' ἐνοικοῦσ' ἄνδρες οἳ τὸν οὐρανὸν
λέγοντες ἀναπείθουσιν ὡς ἔστιν πνιγεὺς
κἄστιν περὶ ἡμᾶς οὗτος, ἡμεῖς δ' ἄνθρακες.

We learn from the argument to the Peace of Aristophanes that Eupolis was awarded the first prize for this play, but whether he profited by the experience of Aristophanes and chose characters that were regarded as more deserving of satire than Socrates, or succeeded for other reasons is only a matter for conjecture. It is possible that Socrates himself was one of the characters in the play, for in a fragment from an unknown comedy of Eupolis (K I 352) he is represented as a prating sophist

ἀλλ' ἀδολεσχεῖν αὐτὸν ἐκδίδαξον, ὦ σοφιστά.

This fragment shows that whatever the play Socrates was one of the characters.

To the same period belongs the Sophists of Plato, but we have too little left from the play to tell what sophists were the prominent characters, or whether the satire was severe. The prejudice against the sophists was doubtless stronger than that against those who restricted their teaching to philosophical investigations. Their professing to be able to make men so skillful in the art of speaking that they could make the worse cause appear the better, carried with it an element of fraud. Besides this they stooped to take pay for their instruction, and this, in the eyes of conservative Athenians was an unpardonable sin.

In a restored fragment from Philodemus (De Vitiis col. X) we are told that the Old Comic poets ridiculed along with Socrates and Pythagoras, if the restoration is correct, Heraclitus and Empedocles.[1] But Heraclitus and Pythagoras were dead when Old Comedy began, and Empedocles died in 435 B.C. Therefore it is not probable that Philodemus can refer to more than a casual reference to any of these philosophers except Socrates, for the Old Comic poets preferred to direct their satire against living men and against men who came into contact with Athenian life.

[1] Mullach, Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum vol. I in Empedocle p. XV

The Treatment of Philosophy in Middle Comedy

When Middle Comedy came in the philosophical surroundings in Athens had undergone a change. What became of Hippo we do not know, but Anaxagoras and Diagoras, as has been mentioned, were accused of atheism and had to leave the state. Protagoras was banished on the same charge in 411 B.C. and on his way to Sicily was drowned. Socrates was put to death in 399 B.C. and thus one of the principal representatives of the new learning was silenced. Gorgias was still living and perhaps still teaching. Whether he taught in Athens after this time we do not know; but he could not have been regarded as much more than a worn-out old man and he was probably never fully identified with such sophists as Protagoras. But so far was philosophy from becoming extinct that it became more widespread than ever. The Socratic schools founded by Euclides of Megara, Antisthenes of Athens, Phaedo of Elis, and Aristippus of Cyrene

now come into existence, and in 387 B.C. Plato founded the Academy. Pythagoreanism had come to life again in Italy and under the leadership of Archytas of Tarentum it assumed the form of a great community. Philosophy seems to have been almost everywhere — in Libya in Italy, in Thebes, in Elis, in Eretria, in Megara, as well as in Athens. If we had nothing more than the fragments of the comic poets of this period we should conclude, and rightly, that philosophy flourished in Athens then as never before, for the plays devoted to the subject and the references to it in other plays were more numerous than in the preceding period. The Plato and the Pythagorean of Aristophon, the Pythagorizusa of Alexis and a play of the same name by Cratinus junior were all devoted to the philosophers; and from the fragments and name of the Tarentini of Cratinus junior and a play of the same name by Alexis it is probable that in these comedies also the philosophers were an important feature. There is no evidence that any poet of this time devoted a play to the

sophists, but it could not have been for the lack of material, for the frequent references to them show that they were more numerous than in the time of Old Comedy.

With the exception of the Plato of Aristophon all the plays that were devoted to a special school of philosophers during Middle Comedy were devoted to the Pythagoreans, but the numerous references to philosophy from other plays show that the subject aside from the Pythagoreans was unusually popular in comedy. The cause of this must have been due to the spread of philosophy itself and especially to the founding of the Academy in Athens. It was not due to a growing opposition to free thought on the part of the comic poets for the fragments left from their works show not only that they were less virulent in their criticisms but that they cherished less ill will towards the philosophers than than the poets of Old Comedy. But the philosophers are still ridiculed, they still prate, they still speak foolishness, and the prejudice against the sophists has not entirely died out.

The place of Socrates in Old Comedy was in Middle Comedy taken

by Plato and his disciples, but there was no sophist who took the place of Protagoras in the Flatterers of Eupolis and perhaps in the Sophists of Plato. Single philosophers here and there were made the objects of ridicule, but no one of them attracted much attention in comparison with Plato. Not even the Cynics with their monotheistic philosophy, "their contempt for temples, vows, sacrifices and prayers"[1] drew forth the criticism that Plato did. They seem to have provoked no criticism while Aristophon, as we have seen, devoted a whole play to Plato. The circle of men who gathered around Plato in the Academy made him a conspicuous figure in Athens. Besides this he was now the principal philosopher here just as Socrates had been in the time of Old Comedy, and it can only be due to this fact that the comic poets mention him so often.

But there is no comment as to the soundness of Plato's theology, nor on the general effect of his teaching, unless it is regarded as productive of idleness, and having a tendency to give his disciples affected ways. It is only external characteristics tha

[1] Zeller, Outlines of Hist. Gk. Phil., p. 121

provoke scorn, and if we can judge from the comic fragments what the philosophers believed and taught was a matter of little concern to the poets of this period. We see this not only in the case of Plato but in the case of the Pythagoreans and all the other philosophers mentioned in Middle Comedy. Old Comedy occupied itself in its criticism of philosophy largely with absurdities, but the attacks of Cratinus upon Hippo, of Aristophanes upon the distorted character of Socrates, and of Eupolis upon Protagoras show that they also went further. In Middle Comedy it is only the absurdities or alleged absurdities of the philosophers that attract attention. They are no longer regarded as the opponents of the national religion and the sowers of evil. It seems that the conservatism of the time of Old Comedy has given way to liberalism, that the religious revival that swept over Greece after the Persian wars has lost its hold upon the people and that we are living in a new age.

This change in the object of criticism is more striking than that in the tone of criticism, though the change in

the latter is marked, and both comedies have been brought about by a favorable attitude of the people towards philosophy. In the time of Old Comedy the state, as we have seen, banished Anaxagoras and Protagoras, set a price upon the head of Diagoras, and put Socrates to death, but with the death of Socrates the opposition of the state seems to have ceased. The fact that the Cynics were allowed to teach without molestation shows that a revolution had taken place in favor of philosophy, for they opposed the Hellenic religion and were as heterodox in this respect as Xenophanes had been. That this change in the attitude of the people should have influenced the comic poets is just what we expect and if the poets went beyond the popular feeling it was probably due only to the nature of their profession and to the example set by the poets of Old Comedy. There are, however, no grounds for concluding that they were in sympathy with the philosophers. The time had not come for that; it was only an age of transition. It is true that we find nowhere in Middle Comedy the violent expressions of Eupolis,

μισῶ δε και τον Σωκράτην τον πτωχόν ἀδολέσχην

nor the sense that we find in his theories, but not enough cant of this kind shows that he regarded philosophers with some favor. Eupolis had called Socrates a beggar, prater and Alexis in a fragment from the Parasite (K. II 344) refers to the work carried on by Plato and his disciples as idle talking.

ἢ μετὰ Πλάτωνος ἀδολεσχεῖν κατὰ μόνας.

In a fragment from the Ankylion of Alexis (K. II 297) we find

λέγεις περὶ ὧν οὐκ οἶσθα· συγγενοῦ τρέχων
Πλάτωνι, καὶ γνώσει λίτρον καὶ κρόμμυον.

The second verse of this probably refers to Plato's teaching of concepts, an example of which we have in a fragment from one of Epicrates' comedies, but the object here seems to be to ridicule Plato's teaching as utterly worthless, and Kock (II 368) is probably right when he takes λίτρον καὶ κρόμμυον as equivalent to nothing. In a fragment from the Dexidemides of Amphis (K. II 238) Plato is ridiculed for his sullen look

ὦ Πλάτων,
ὡς οὐδὲν οἶσθα πλὴν σκυθρωπάζειν μόνον
ὥσπερ κοχλίας σεμνῶς ἐπηρκὼς τὰς ὀφρῦς.

According to a fragment from [illegible] (K II 274) Plato's books are [illegible]

Λιβυκὸν τὸ πέπερι, θυμίαμα, βιβλίον
Πλάτωνος ἐμβρόντητον

In a passage from the Antaeus of Antiphanes (K II 23) we have a satire on the luxury of Plato or some philosopher of the Academy.

ὦ τάν, κατανοεῖς τίς ποτ' ἐστὶν οὑτοσὶ
ὁ γέρων; Β ἀπὸ τῆς μὲν ὄψεως Ἑλληνικός·
λευκὴ χλανίς, φαιὸς χιτωνίσκος καλός,
πιλίδιον ἁπαλόν, εὔρυθμος βακτηρία,
βεβαία τράπεζα· τί μακρὰ δεῖ λέγειν; ὅλως
αὐτὴν ὁρᾶν γὰρ τὴν Ἀκαδήμειαν δοκῶ

In a fragment from the Nauagus of Ephippus (K II 257) we find the following satire on Plato and his disciples

ἔπειτ' ἀναστὰς εὔστοχος νεανίας
τῶν ἐξ Ἀκαδημείας τις ὑπὸ Πλάτωνα καὶ
Βρυσωνοθρασυμαχειοληψικερμάτων,
πληγεὶς ἀνάγκῃ, ληψολιγομίσθῳ τέχνῃ

συνών τις, οὐκ ἄσκεπτα δυνάμενος λέγειν,
εὖ μὲν μαχαίρᾳ ξύστ' ἔχων τριχώματα,
εὖ δ' ὑποκαθιεὶς ἄτομα πώγωνος βάθη,
εὖ δ' ἐν πεδίλῳ πόδα τιθεὶς ὑπὸ ξυρόν,
κνήμης ἱμάντων ἰσομέτροις ἑλίγμασιν,
ὄγκῳ τε χλανίδος εὖ τεθωρακισμένος,
σχῆμ' ἀξιόχρεων ἐπικαθεὶς βακτηρίᾳ,
ἀλλότριον, οὐκ οἰκεῖον, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ,
ἔλεξεν· 'ἄνδρες τῆς Ἀθηναίων χθονός.'

Athenaeus (509c) says that Ephippus satirized Plato and his disciples here on the ground that they argued sophistically for money and on account of their luxury. We do not know how much reason Plato and his disciples gave for criticism in the matter of dress, but they doubtless presented a striking contrast to the philosophers of the Cynic school and others who affected the appearance of strict philosophers. Plato was an aristocrat, a descendant of an illustrious house, and if we can rely on the information given by Diogenes Laertius III 7 he was far from being poor. His reputation brought men from all

parts of the Greek world to listen to his discourses and it is very probable that, surrounded by such a circle of admirers, he first devised [illegible] became the tradition and birth. Whether the doctrines were given to pupils first recorded from his lectures, or [illegible] which may have been paid at their person we can only conjecture. Plato's attitude towards the democracy and his holding aloof from public affairs, are not referred to in the fragments left us unless we refer to the head [illegible] passage from the Dexidemides of Amphis where he is ridiculed for his sullen looks. The only reference to his doctrine is in a fragment from the Olympiodorus of Alexis (K II 355)

σῶμα μὲν ἐμοῦ τὸ θνητὸν αὖον ἐγένετο,
τὸ δ' ἀθάνατον ἐξῆρε πρὸς τὸν ἀέρα.
B. ταῦτ' οὐ σχολὴ Πλάτωνος;

That we have no other reference to his doctrine is probably due to the loss of many, all of the most [illegible] who treated him. [illegible], as [illegible] had been [illegible], devoted a whole play to him, but unfortunately no [illegible] have [illegible] preserved us nothing

from this except Athenaeus that he was exceedingly, or else lean as to become that Philippides, the noted Athenian comic poet, could probably be placed in a catalogue of lean men whom it is found necessary to mention. The following (K II 279) is the only fragment preserved.

ἐν ἡμέραις τρισὶν

ἰσχνότερον αὐτὸν ἀποφανῶ Φιλιππίδου.

B. οὕτως ἐν ἡμέραις ὀλίγαις νεκροὺς ποιεῖς

Plato is here perhaps represented as setting forth the merits of his instruction, but this is only a matter for conjecture, and all that seems to be clear is that he or one of his associates is represented as undertaking some absurdity. It is probable that the Dexidemides of Amphis was designed to ridicule Plato, for from the fragment quoted we see that he was one of the characters. There is however no evidence for concluding that he was brought upon the stage as a character in any other play of this period.

Some of the references to Plato are almost void of ridicule. In a passage from the Hedychares of Theopompus (K I 739) we

belongs to the Old as well as to the Middle Comedy, a certain character says:

ἓν γάρ ἐστιν οὐδὲ ἕν,

τὰ δὲ δύο μόλις ἕν ἐστιν, ὥς φησιν Πλάτων.

Again in a passage from the Pseudobolimaeus of Cratinus junior (K II 292)

ἄνθρωπος εἶ δήπουθεν καὶ ψυχὴν ἔχεις,

B. κατὰ μὲν Πλάτωνα οὐκ οἶδ', ὑπονοῶ δ' ὧδ' ἔχειν.

In a fragment from an unknown play by Epicrates (K II 287) we have a comic representation of the work going on under Plato's supervision in the Academy.

τί Πλάτων

καὶ Σπεύσιππος καὶ Μενέδημος

πρὸς τίσι νυνὶ διατρίβουσιν;

ποία φροντίς, ποῖος δὲ λόγος

διερευνᾶται παρὰ τούτοισιν;

τάδε μοι πινυτῶς, εἴ τι κατειδὼς

ἥκεις, λέξον πρὸς Γᾶς,

B. ἀλλ' οἶδα λέγειν περὶ τῶνδε σαφῶς

Παναθηναίοις γὰρ ἰδὼν ἀγέλην
μειρακίων
ἐν γυμνασίοις Ἀκαδημείας
ἤκουσα λόγων ἀφάτων ἀτόπων·
περὶ γὰρ φύσεως ἀφοριζόμενοι
διεχώριζον ζῴων τε βίον
δένδρων τε φύσιν λαχάνων τε γένη.
κᾆτ' ἐν τούτοις τὴν κολοκύντην
ἐξήταζον τίνος ἐστὶ γένους.
Α. καὶ τί ποτ' ἄρ' ὡρίσαντο καὶ τίνος γένους
εἶναι τὸ φυτόν; δήλωσον, εἰ κατοισθά τι.
Β. πρώτιστα μὲν οὖν πάντες ἀναυδεῖς
τότ' ἐπέστησαν, καὶ κύψαντες
χρόνον οὐκ ὀλίγον διεφρόντιζον.
κᾆτ' ἐξαίφνης ἔτι κυπτόντων
καὶ ζητούντων τῶν μειρακίων
λάχανόν τις ἔφη στρογγύλον εἶναι,
ποίαν δ' ἄλλος, δένδρον δ' ἕτερος.
ταῦτα δ' ἀκούων ἰατρός τις

Σικελᾶς ἀπὸ γᾶς κατέπαρδ' αὐτῶν

ὡς ληρούντων.

A. ἦ που δεινῶς ὠργίσθησαν

χλευάζεσθαί τ' ἐβόησαν·

τὸ γὰρ ἐν λέσχαις ταῖσδε τοιαυτὶ

ποιεῖν ἀπρεπές.

B. οὐδ' ἐμέλησεν τοῖς μειρακίοις·

ὁ Πλάτων δὲ παρὼν καὶ μάλα πρᾴως,

οὐδὲν ὀρινθείς, ἐπέταξ' αὐτοῖς

πάλιν ⟨ἐξ ἀρχῆς τὴν κολοκύντην⟩

ἀφορίζεσθαι τίνος ἐστὶ γένους·

οἳ δὲ διῄρουν.

This bears a slight resemblance to the scene in the Clouds of Aristophanes (185 foll.) where the disciples of Socrates are represented as investigating the things under the earth, and the whole piece is probably nothing less than a satire on the pretensions of Plato's teaching. The poet appears to have some knowledge of Plato's method, his teaching of concepts, but while he ridicules the teaching he spares Plato and

gives us a different picture of the philosopher from that given in the Dexidemides of Amphis where he is ridiculed for his sullen looks.

From these examples we see that the ridicule to which Plato was subjected was not very severe, and that they give a correct notion of the treatment that he received may be inferred from the fact that Diogenes Laertius quoted some of them to show that he was ridiculed by the Comic poets. Ten poets of this period mention him in their comedies, and of this number Alexis mentions him most frequently, or in five plays, but his criticisms are no more severe than those of the other poets, and to judge from the fragments of his works he did not bring Plato upon the stage as a character in any of his comedies.

Alexis did not restrict his ridicule to Plato and the Pythagoreans, for he represents the sophists in the Lyceum and Odeum as well as those in the Academy as engaged in idle talking. This fragment is from the Asotodidaskalos (I 3(?)) and in it a certain house servant urges his fellow servant to

abandon philosophy and enjoy life.

τί ταῦτα ληρεῖς, φλυαρῶν ἄνω κάτω
Λύκειον, Ἀκαδήμειαν, Ὠιδείου πύλας,
λήρους σοφιστῶν; οὐδὲ ἓν τούτων καλόν.
πίνω ἐμπίνωμεν ὦ Σίκων, Σίκων,
χαίρωμεν ἕως ἔνεστι τὴν ψυχὴν τρέφειν

This and a fragment from the Cleophanes of Antiphanes are the only passages from Middle Comedy in which we have possible references to Aristotle and his followers, and even here it is improbable that Aristotle is meant. The fragment from the Cleophanes cannot refer to him unless it belongs to the very close of Antiphanes' life and to the first three years after the founding of the Peripatetic school. Besides this it is not likely that either poet would have dared to ridicule Aristotle from the stage, for he did not figure in Athens as an independent philosopher until after the battle of Chaeronea and then he enjoyed the favor of Alexander and the Macedonian party. This will doubtless account for his not being ridiculed by the

comic poets. The fact that he found it advisable to leave Athens after the death of Alexander shows that without political protection he would have been especially subject to comic criticism. It is probable, therefore, that both poets refer to sophists who used the Lyceum as a lecturing place before a special school was opened there just as in the case of the Odeum where no school was opened until Chrysippus assumed the leadership of the Stoics.

Antiphanes in the fragment (K. II 58) referred to also ridicules the sophists and pretends to give a specimen of the information to be derived from studying under them.

τὸ δὲ τυραννεῖν ἔστιν

ἢ τί ποτε τὸ σπουδαῖον, ἀκολουθῶν ἐρεῖς
ἐν τῷ Λυκείῳ μετὰ σοφιστῶν νὴ Δία
λεπτῶν ἀσίτων συκίνων, λέγοντας ὅτι
τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦτ' οὐκ ἔστιν εἴπερ γίνεται·
οὐδ' ἔστι γάρ πω γινόμενον ὃ γίνεται,
οὔτ' εἰ πρότερον ἦν, ἔστιν ὅ γε νῦν γίνεται·
ἔστιν γὰρ οὐκ ὂν οὐδέν· ὃ δὲ μὴ γέγονέ πω,

οὐκ ἔσθ᾽. ἕωσπερ γέγονεν, ἐγρήγορεν πω·
ἐκ τοῦ γὰρ εἶναι γέγονεν· εἰ δ᾽ οὐκ ἦν ὅθεν,
πῶς ἐγένετ᾽ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντος; οὐχ οἷόν τε γάρ.
εἰ δ᾽ αὐτόθεν που γέγονεν, οὐκ ἔσται
κηπαι ὁπόποτις εἴη, πόθεν εἰσηγήσεται
τοὐκ ὂν εἰς οὐκ ὄν· εἰς οὐκ ὂν γὰρ οὐ ἡνυγήσεται!
ταυτὶ δ᾽ ὅ τι ἐστὶν οὐδ᾽ ἂν Ἀπόλλων μάθοι.

Athenaeus compares with this a letter written to the rulers of Cassandrea by Alexarchus the brother of Cassander. Alexarchus was in the habit of coining words and consequently this letter of only twenty words was, as Athenaeus says, too obscure for even Apollo to understand.

In the Galatea of Alexis (K. II 311) Aristippus is ridiculed for his licentiousness.

ὁ δεσπότης οὗτος περὶ λόγους γάρ ποτε
διέτριψε μειρακίσκος ὢν καὶ φιλοσοφεῖν
ἐπέθετο· Κυρηναῖος ἦν ἐνταῦθά τις,
ὥς φασ᾽, Ἀρίστιππος, σοφιστὴς εὐφυής,
μᾶλλον δὲ πρωτεύων ἁπάντων τῶν τότε

ἀκοιχετίᾳ τε τῶν γεγονότων διαφόρων.
τούτῳ τάλαντον ὅλως μαθητὴς γίνεται
ὁ δεσπότης.

But Aristippus probably received no more censure from the comic poets than from others, for from Athenaeus (544 d) we learn that his philosophy of life especially as practiced by himself did not meet with universal approbation. Alexis also wrote a play called the Phaedrus in which he introduced a certain character philosophizing about the nature of love (K II 245). The name of the play and the nature of this fragment make it probable that we have here a reference to the Socratic Phaedrus, or that the Platonic dialogue of this name suggested the subject of the comedy to Alexis. The character in the passage attempts to define love, and [illegible] (II 369) sees in this an evident trace of a lecture of Plato's, but there are no grounds for concluding anything more about the nature of the play.

Philodemus (De vitiis col X), as was stated above, says that the poets of Old Comedy ridiculed Pythagoras, but whether he refers to

some criticism of Pythagoras himself or to satire directed against living representatives of his school, we do not know. Plato (Phaedo 59C) represents the Pythagoreans Cebes and Simmias as being in Athens at the time of the death of Socrates, but with the exception of these two we know the names of no Pythagoreans who were here during the time of Old Comedy. Not a single fragment has been left from the comedies of this period in which these philosophers are mentioned, and but for the unsatisfactory reference of Philodemus we should infer that they were passed over without any notice. When it became popular for the Old Comic poets to ridicule the philosophers from the stage the Pythagorean association in Lower Italy had been broken up, the members had been killed or scattered, and the school was doubtless regarded as dead. Philolaus who came to Thebes about 440 B.C. committed the doctrines of the sect to writing but to a people who did not read the doctrines were as dead as the sect itself, and Old Comedy was not disposed to deal with dead theories

any more than with dead men

In Middle Comedy no other sect was ridiculed as much as the Pythagoreans. Whole plays, as we have seen, were devoted to them by Alexis, Aristophon, and Cratinus junior. It is a subject of which the comic poets seem never to tire, and from the number of plays devoted to it, and the references to the subject from other plays one might infer that the followers of Pythagoras were at this time as well known in Athens as in Crotona in the time of Pythagoras himself, and that they were as strict in observing the regulations of their order as in the early days of its existence.

Whether Pythagoreans were attracted to Athens through the close relations between the Older Academy and Pythagoreanism or because of commercial relations between Athens and Tarentum we do not know. We have no evidence that an association of these philosophers existed in Athens during Middle Comedy, unless we find such evidence in the fragments of the comic poets. Alexis in the Tarentini mentions several men in Athens as mem-

of this school, but from the nature of the passage it cannot be known whether the poet is in earnest or not. The other poets in their ridicule do not mention any particular persons, but it is not probable that they would have paid so much attention to the subject if there had been no Pythagoreans nearer than Tarentum.

In the plays devoted to these philosophers the ridicule was not prompted so much by hostility as by contempt, and the desire to excite laughter was the ruling motive. It was not their doctrine that provoked ridicule, but what they ate and wore, their abstinence from flesh and wine, their scanty fare, their poor clothes, their dirt, and their lice. From the fragments left us we cannot tell whether the poets knew anything about their philosophy or not. They knew the Pythagoreans as vegetarians, as opposed to the use of wine; these were popular notions about them and just such characteristics as these could most easily be turned into ridicule. Their philosophy was not so easy to comprehend whereas the most stupid spectator could enjoy the jokes about the 'imperco-

and squalid appearance of these vegetarians. If the poets had been opposed to their teaching we should expect here as well as in the case of Plato something more than this shallow criticism, this striving after the ridiculous. They found in the philosophers a vast storehouse from which to draw material for their comedies, and we may not far from right if we conclude that they would have shed tears of genuine, though perhaps selfish sorrow over the grave of the last philosopher.

The Pythagoreans are never mentioned by the comic poets as immoral or ungodly, on the contrary they are commended for their piety; this however is coupled with ridicule and was probably manufactured for the occasion. The reference to their piety occurs in a fragment from the Pythagorean of Aristophon, (K II 280)

ἔφη τε καταβὰς εἰς δίαιταν τῶν κάτω
ἰδεῖν ἑκάστους, διαφέρειν δὲ πάμπολυ
τοὺς Πυθαγοριστὰς τῶν νεκρῶν· μόνοισι γὰρ
τούτοισι τὸν Πλούτωνα συσσιτεῖν ἔφη

δι' εὐσέβειαν. Β. εὐχερῆ θεὸν λέγεις,
εἰ τοῖς ῥύπου μεστοῖσιν ἥδεται ξυνών.
ἐσθίουσί τε
λάχανά τε καὶ πίνουσιν ἐπὶ τούτοις ὕδωρ·
φθεῖρας δὲ καὶ τρίβωνα τήν τ' ἀλουσίαν
οὐδεὶς ἂν ὑπομείνειε τῶν νεωτέρων

In another fragment from the same play (K. II 279) we have the same kind of ridicule.

πρὸς τῶν θεῶν οἰόμεσθα τοὺς πάλαι ποτὲ
τοὺς Πυθαγοριστὰς γενομένους ὄντως ῥυπᾶν
ἑκόντας, ἢ φορεῖν τρίβωνας ἡδέως;
οὐκ ἔστι τούτων οὐδέν, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ·
ἀλλ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης, οὐκ ἔχοντες οὐδὲ ἕν,
τῆς εὐτελείας πρόφασιν εὑρόντες καλὴν
ὅρους ἔπηξαν τοῖς πένησι χρησίμους.
ἐπεὶ παράθες αὐτοῖσιν ἰχθῦς ἢ κρέας
κἂν μὴ κατεσθίωσι καὶ τοὺς δακτύλους
ἐθέλω κρέμασθαι δεκάκις.

Alexis in the Tarentini (K. II 378) ridicules their frugality

Πυθαγορισμοὶ καὶ λόγοι
λεπτοὶ διεσμιλευμέναι τε φροντίδες
τρέφουσ' ἐκείνους, τὰ δὲ καθ' ἡμέραν τάδε·
ἄρτος καθαρὸς εἷς ἑκατέρῳ, ποτήριον
ὕδατος· τοσαῦτα ταῦτα. Β. δεσμωτηρίου
λέγεις δίαιταν. πάντες οὕτως οἱ σοφοὶ
διάγουσι καὶ τοιαῦτα κακοπαθοῦσί που;
Α. τρυφῶσιν οὗτοι πρὸς ἑτέρους. ἆρ' οἶσθ' ὅτι
Μελανιππίδης ἑταῖρός ἐστι καὶ Φάων
καὶ Φυρόμαχος καὶ Φᾶνος, οἳ δι' ἡμέρας
δειπνοῦσι πέμπτης ἀλφίτων κοτύλην μίαν;

In the same play (K II 378) Alexis makes sport of their vegetarianism

οἱ Πυθαγορίζοντες γάρ, ὡς ἀκούομεν,
οὔτ' ὄψον ἐσθίουσιν οὔτ' ἄλλ' οὐδὲ ἓν
ἔμψυχον, οἶνόν τ' οὐχὶ πίνουσιν μόνοι.
Β. Ἐπιχαρίδης μέντοι κύνας κατεσθίει,
τῶν Πυθαγοριστῶν εἷς. Α. ἀποκτείνας γέ που·
οὐκ ἔτι γάρ ἐστ' ἔμψυχον

Of the men whom Alexis mentions here as Pythagoreans nothing

further is known. The real design of the last fragment was to ridicule Epicharides whom Alexis mentions in a passage from the Phaedrus as being such a spendthrift that he squandered his paternal estate in five days.

Antiphanes in a fragment from the Monuments (K II 76) also makes sport of the vegetarianism of these philosophers

τῶν Πυθαγοριστῶν δ' ἔτυχον ἄθλιοί τινες
ἐν τῇ χαράδρᾳ τρώγοντες ἅλιμα καὶ κακὰ
τοιαῦτα συλλέγοντες ἐν τῷ κωρύκῳ

Again in the Wallet (K II 67).

πρῶτον μὲν ὥσπερ Πυθαγορίζων ἐσθίει
ἔμψυχον οὐδέν, τῆς δὲ πλείστης τοὐβόλου
μάζης μελαγχρῆ μερίδα λαμβάνων λέπει.

Besides these fragments casual references to the Pythagoreans occur here and there, but little importance can be attached to them except in so far as they serve to show how common a thing it was to speak of these philosophers and how popular the subject was regarded by the comic poets. That the subject was popular may also be seen from the fact that Alexis,

Aristophon, and Cratinus junior devoted a play each to it. Amphis and Mnesimachus wrote each a play called the Alcmaeon. (K II 231 + 236) and in the fragment left from the play by Mnesimachus we have a reference to the Pythagoreans. This was quoted by Diogenes Laertius (VIII 37) as a specimen of the satire directed against these philosophers. Besides this the title of the plays is significant and it is probable that the name of this supposed disciple of Pythagoras was used as the title of plays in which new features of this popular subject were brought out. After Middle Comedy the Pythagoreans are not mentioned and from this alone we might infer that the order had ceased to attract much attention in Athens

The Attitude of the Poets of New Comedy

We pass now to New Comedy, the comedy of character and manners. Here the philosophers are still the objects of criticism, but it is neither the abuse of Old nor the ridicule of Middle Comedy. In one or two cases the tone is that of the ridicule of Middle Comedy, but this is not the rule. The criticisms of the philosophers is now for the most part put in the mouths of slaves, courtesans, and cooks and Lerus is doubtless right when he says (II 520) that this shows how little seriousness there was in it. In New Comedy just as in Middle comedy nothing is said about the evil tendencies in philosophical investigations. The prejudice against the philosophers seems to have given way and that they were still subjects to comic criticism was due rather to the profession of the comic poets and to the example set by Old and Middle Comedy than to a real prejudice against philosophy.

The philosophical schools in Athens were now more numerous and more popular than in the preceding period,

The Peripatetic school was founded near the close of the period assigned to Middle Comedy and after the death of Aristotle it was led by Theophrastus, Strato, and Lyco. The Academy was still flourishing. The Epicurean school was founded in 306 B.C. and in 300 B.C. Zeno founded the Stoic school. This seems to be the beginning of a period which worked a complete revolution in favor of philosophy so much so that in 157 B.C. an embassy of three philosophers was sent from Athens to Rome to secure a diminution of the fine which had been imposed on the Athenians for making a raid upon the town of Oropus. During this period just as in the preceding the philosophers met with little opposition from the state. In 333-2 B.C. a charge of sacrilege was brought against Aristotle, and in 306 B.C. all the philosophers were banished from Athens; but in both cases the opposition arose from other causes than a real prejudice against philosophy. Some of the philosophers of this time were very popular. Diogenes Laertius (V 37) tells us that the popularity of Theophrastus was such that when a certain Agonides brought a charge of

impiety against him Agonides lost his suit and came near incurring a penalty besides. In the same passage Diogenes tells us that the number of Theophrastus' disciples amounted to two thousand. We also learn from Diogenes (VII 173) that when the poet Sositheus ridiculed Cleanthes who was present at the time, the spectators out of sympathy with the philosopher forced the poet to leave the theater. The fact that during New Comedy only one play was devoted exclusively to the philosophers indicates that a demand for comedies of this kind had decreased.

In only one fragment do we find anything that seems to show real hostility to philosophy, and this cannot be regarded as indicative of genuine hostility if we consider the circumstances under which it was written. The fragment is from the Knight of Alexis (K II 327) and the satire is directed against Xenocrates and the philosophy of the Academy, the only case in which Xenocrates or the Academy is mentioned in New Comedy.

τοῦτ' ἔστιν Ἀκαδήμεια, τοῦτο Ξενοκράτης

πολλ' ἀγαθὰ δοῖεν οἱ θεοὶ Δημητρίῳ
καὶ τοῖς νομοθέταις, διότι τοὺς τὰς τῶν λόγων,
ὥς φασι, δυνάμεις παραδιδόντας τοῖς νέοις
εἰς κόρακας ἐρρίφασιν ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς.

Alexis lived and wrote thirty years after the beginning of New Comedy, but he lived through the whole time of Middle Comedy and his attitude here seems to be that of the poets of one of the preceding periods. The tone is not very unlike that of Aristophanes in the Clouds, but it was uttered under unusual circumstances, and cannot be taken as characteristic of New Comedy. Meineke and Kock think the reference here to Xenocrates sufficient evidence for concluding that the play was brought out before his death (315 B.C.) This would place the banishment of the philosophers in the same period, but Hoffmann[1] places this in 306 B.C. and this seems to be the correct date. There is little probability that the Demetrius referred to in the fragment is, as Meineke and Kock think, Demetrius of Phalerum. Reference is made here to a decree proposed by a certain Sophokles (Ath. L.Z 38)

[1] See Windelband, Geschichte der alten Philosophie § 45

and in accordance with which all the philosophers were banished from Athens. That this should have occurred during the rule of Demetrius of Phalerum is altogether improbable and it seems impossible that he should have been influential in banishing the philosophers. But this is indicated in the fragment. Diogenes Laertius (V 75) tells us that Demetrius of Phalerum was a disciple of Theophrastus, and he numbers him among the philosophers. In IV 14 he says that when the Athenians sold Xenocrates because he was not able to pay the tax of twelve drachmae levied on the resident aliens, Demetrius bought him and restored him to liberty, and in V 39 that he assisted Theophrastus in acquiring a private garden. But Theophrastus as well as all the other philosophers were in consequence of this decree banished from Athens. All the evidence, unless it is the reference to Xenocrates, serves to prove that this was written not before Xenocrates' death but after it and that the Demetrius referred to is Demetrius Poliorcetes. In 307 B.C. Demetrius Poliorcetes drove Demetrius of Phalerum from

Athens proclaiming that his object was the expulsion of the Macedonian garrison and the liberation of the people. What can be more probable than that some base Sophokles, wishing to curry favor with the new ruler, should have proposed a decree banishing the philosophers with whom Demetrius of Phalerum had identified himself. The fact that Demetrius Poliorcetes left Athens the next year 306 B.C. and that in the same year the law was repealed and the philosophers allowed to return strengthens the probability that it is Demetrius Poliorcetes to whom reference is here made.

It is probable that we have here an attempt of the poet to echo the popular feeling and to praise Demetrius who had restored to the Athenians their ancient constitution. But that he was not echoing the popular feeling can be seen from the fact that as soon as Demetrius Poliorcetes left Athens the decree was repealed, the philosophers were allowed to return, and Sophokles was fined ten talents for proposing the decree.[1] In the reference to Xenocrates we

[1] Diog. Laert. V 38

probably have the words of some one who has heard the nature and influence of the instruction that had been given in the Academy. It is a little strange that Polemo is not referred to instead of Xenocrates, but Xenocrates had been at the head of the Academy for twenty-five years when he was succeeded by Polemo, and was doubtless considered the author of much that was taught there even after his death. Besides this the Academy had been closed and so far as instruction was concerned seemed to be as dead as Xenocrates.

The only poet of this period who devoted a whole comedy to the philosophers was Philemon, but we have too little left from it to form any notion of the way in which he treated his subject. Denis (II 433) says that Philemon wrote this play to please the people who still retained their old prejudice against reason. But the attitude of the people towards Theophrastus and later towards the Stoic Cleanthes shows that the opposition to free thought had well nigh ceased. It is therefore probable that Philemon was simply following the

example of the poets of Middle Comedy to whom he stands so closely related in time, or else we must conclude that he was opposed to philosophy. This play, the Philosophers was probably devoted to several schools, but the only fragment left (K II 502) refers to Zeno.

φιλοσοφίαν καινὴν γὰρ οὗτος φιλοσοφεῖ·
πεινῆν διδάσκει καὶ μαθητὰς λαμβάνει.
εἷς ἄρτος, ὄψον ἰσχάς, ἐπιπιεῖν ὕδωρ.

Diogenes Laertius (VII 27) takes this as an unintentional encomium on Zeno, and this with two references to the Cynic Crates and one to Monimus seems to have been all that he thought worth collecting from the whole of New Comedy. One of the references to Crates is from a play of Philemon's (K II 523), probably the Philosophers.

καὶ τοῦ θέρους μὲν εἶχεν ἱμάτιον δασύ,
ἵν' ἐγκρατὴς ᾖ, τοῦ δὲ χειμῶνος ῥάκος.

From the Pyrrhus of Philemon (K II 496) we have a third fragment concerning the philosophers.

οἱ φιλόσοφοι ζητοῦσιν, ὡς ἀκήκοα,
περὶ τοῦτό τ' αὐτοῖς πολὺς ἀναλοῦται χρόνος,

τί ἐστιν ἀγαθόν, κοὐδὲ εἷς εὕρηκέ πω
τί ἐστιν. ἀρετὴν καὶ φρόνησίν φασι, καὶ
λέγουσι πάντα μᾶλλον ἢ τί ἀγαθόν.
ἐν ἀγρῷ διατρίβων τήν τε γῆν σκάπτων ἐγὼ
νῦν εὗρον· εἰρήνη 'στιν· ὦ Ζεῦ φίλτατε,
τῆς ἐπαφροδίτου καὶ φιλανθρώπου θεοῦ.
γάμους, ἑορτάς, συγγενεῖς, παῖδας, φίλους,
πλοῦτον, ὑγίειαν, σῖτον, οἶνον, ἡδονὴν
αὕτη δίδωσι· ταῦτα πάντ' ἂν ἐκλίπῃ,
τέθνηκε κοινῇ πᾶς ὁ τῶν ζώντων βίος.

Philemon may have expressed his view here as to the utility of philosophy, but it is more probable that the philosophers were brought in simply to help out the situation. The real design of the piece seems to have been to deprecate the unsettled condition of things in Athens at this time and to advocate peace, and the tone is somewhat similar to that of Dicaeopolis in the opening of the Acharnians of Aristophanes. There is no statement as to the time when the Pyrrhus was brought out, but the reference to the Stoic school in ἀρετὴν καὶ φρόνησιν in line 4 shows that the

date must have been later than 300 B.C. If the real design was to associate peace and not to ridicule the philosophers it would be safe to place the time of production about 275 B.C. Athens had at this time been for over twenty years the sport of the contending successors of Alexander and it was now besieged by Demetrius Poliorcetes and reduced to extreme famine.

The philosophers that received most censure from the poets of this period were the Stoics, but Epicurus and his school were received with more favor. The comic poets had found at last one philosopher who deserved praise, he had solved the problem which had engaged the attention of the philosophers for generations, he alone knew the nature of the summum bonum. But Epicurus did not receive universal commendation, for some of this praise can be nothing less than irony. Athenaeus (278 f) quotes him as saying that τὸ ἀγαθόν was to be found only in the gratifications of the appetites, and that this popular notion of his philosophy was the notion the comic poets had or pretended to have of it can be seen from an enumera-

tion of a few fragments. In a fragment from the Manslayer of Bato (K III 327) we have

> ἐξὸν γυναῖκ' ἔχοντα κατακεῖσθαι καλήν,
> καὶ Λεσβίου χυτρῖδε λαμβάνειν δύο·
> ὁ φρόνιμος (αὐτός) ἐστιν, τοῦτο τἀγαθόν.
> Ἐπίκουρος ἔλεγε ταῦθ' ἃ νῦν ἐγὼ λέγω.
> εἰ τοῦτον ἔζων πάντες ὃν ἐγὼ ζῶ βίον,
> οὔτ' ἄτοπος ἦν ἂν οὔτε μοιχὸς οὐδὲ εἷς.

Again from the Philetaeri of Hegesippus (K III 314)

> Ἐπίκουρος ὁ σοφὸς ἀξιώσαντός τινος
> εἰπεῖν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὅτι ποτ' ἐστὶ τἀγαθόν,
> ὃ διὰ τέλους ζητοῦσιν, εἶπεν ἡδονήν.
> εὖ γ', ὦ κράτιστ' ἄνθρωπε καὶ σοφώτατε·
> τοῦ γὰρ μασᾶσθαι κρεῖττον οὐκ ἔστ' οὐδὲ ἓν
> ἀγαθόν· πρόσεστιν ἡδονῇ γὰρ τἀγαθόν.

In a fragment from the Synexapaton of Bato (K III 328) a slave who has ruined the youth entrusted to his care on being remonstrated with by his master, defends his course by professing to have followed the philosophy of Epicurus

ἀπολώλεκας τὸ μειράκιόν μου παραλαβών,
ἄνθρωπε, καὶ πέπεικας ἐλθεῖν εἰς βίον
ἀλλότριον αὐτοῦ, καὶ πότους ἑωθινοὺς
πίνειν διὰ σὲ νῦν, πρότερον οὐκ εἰθισμένον.
Β. εἶτ' εἰ μεμάθηκε, δέσποτα, ζῆν, ἐγκαλεῖς;
Α. ζῆν δ' ἐστὶ τὸ τοιοῦτ'; Β. ὡς λέγουσιν οἱ σοφοί.
ὁ γοῦν Ἐπίκουρός φησιν εἶναι τἀγαθὸν
τὴν ἡδονὴν δήπουθεν· οὐκ ἔστιν δ' ἔχειν
ταύτην ἑτέρωθεν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ζῆν παγκάλως
ἴσως ἅπαντας εὐτυχεῖν ὁμόσας ἐροῖ.

In the latter part of the same fragment the philosophers are represented as carrying out this popular notion of Epicurean philosophy to such an extent that they even get drunk.

ἑόρακας οὖν φιλόσοφον, εἰπέ μοι, τινὰ
μεθύοντ' ἐπὶ τούτοις οἷς λέγεις κηλούμενον;
Β. ἅπαντας· οἱ γοῦν τὰς ὀφρῦς ἐπηρκότες
καὶ τὸν φρόνιμον ζητοῦντες ἐν τοῖς περιπάτοις
καὶ ταῖς διατριβαῖς ὥσπερ ἀποδεδρακότα,

Athenaeus (279) quotes these fragments to show that the comic poets

were not in sympathy with the philosophy of Epicurus for he says that they erroneously inveighed against pleasure and inconvenience. Whatever may be said of the first two fragments, it is hardly possible to take the third as expressing a favorable opinion of Epicureanism. It cannot be much less than the condemnation of this doctrine and it shows the result of such a theory when put into practice. If we form an opinion of Epicurus from the references of the comic poets we conclude that he was a voluptuary and that his aim was to take in the whole round of pleasures in life. We get no idea of the sober philosopher whose philosophy aimed not at the gratification of individual appetites, but at the happiness of a whole life, and which regarded happiness and virtue as necessarily concomitant. From what Athenaeus (278) tells us Epicurus may have stated his doctrine in such a way that this popular notion could be taken of it, and it was just this view that presented features suitable for comedy. It is probable that the comic poets themselves are in some measure responsible for this interpretation of Epicureanism for they being. Laert X 138

both the peace of a person who thinks very [illegible] to the stage reached the whole people. The fact that Epicurus' opinions were [illegible] in the greatest grand game the comic composers [illegible] for them, and that they distorted the correct view was quite natural, for we do not expect a true reproduction of any philosophy on the comic stage.

With the exception of Bato none of the poets of New Comedy have left us anything that seems to be a censure of the philosophy of Epicurus, but it may be well to state that only four of them mentioned him at all, and one of these was Menander. None of them, however, have left any favorable comments on the Stoics. This is just what we expect if Epicurus was in the eyes of the comic poets the ideal philosopher, for no two systems stand in stronger contrast. In a fragment from the Syntrophi of Damoxenus (K. III 350) the philosophy of Epicurus is compared with that of the Stoics:

Ἐπίκουρος οὕτω κατεπύκνου τὴν ἡδονήν·
ἐμασᾶτ' ἐπιμελῶς, εἶδε τἀγαθὸν μόνος
ἐκεῖνος οἷόν ἐστιν· οἱ δ' ἐν τῇ στοᾷ

ζητοῦσι συνεχῶς αὐτὸ ἔτ' οὐκ εἰδότες,
οὐκοῦν ὅ γ' οὐκ ἔχουσιν, ἀγνοοῦσι δέ,
οὐδ' ἂν ἑτέρῳ δοίησαν. Β. οὕτω συνδοκεῖ.

A fragment from the Manslayer of Bato (K III 326) was apparently directed against the Stoics

τῶν φιλοσόφων τοὺς σώφρονας ἐνταυθοῖ καλῶ
τοὺς ἀγαθὸν αὑτοῖς οὐ διδόντας οὐδὲ ἕν,
τοὺς τὸν φρόνιμον ζητοῦντας ἐν τοῖς περιπάτοις
καὶ ταῖς διατριβαῖς ὥσπερ ἀποδεδρακότα.
ἄνθρωπ' ἀλάστωρ, διὰ τί συμβολὰς ἔχων
νήφεις; τί τηλικοῦτον ἀδικεῖς τοὺς θεούς;
τί τἀργύριον, ἄνθρωπε, τιμιώτερον
σαυτοῦ τέθεικας ἢ πέφυκε τῇ φύσει;
ἀλυσιτελὴς εἶ τῇ πόλει πίνων ὕδωρ·
τὸν γὰρ γεωργὸν καὶ τὸν ἔμπορον κακοῖς,
ἐγὼ τὰς προσόδους μεθύων καλὰς ποιῶ.
ἔπειτ' ἕωθεν περιάγεις τὴν λήκυθον
καταμανθάνων τοὔλαιον, ὥστε περιφέρειν
ὡρολόγιον δόξει τις, οὐχὶ λήκυθον

In the Philargyrus of Theognetus K. III 364 a certain character has been lectured by a member of the Stoic school until losing all patience he breaks out with

ἄνθρωπ' ἀπολεῖς με, τῶν γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ποικίλης
στοᾶς λογαρίων ἀναπεπλησμένος νοσεῖς·
'ἀλλότριόν ἐσθ' ὁ πλοῦτος ἀνθρώπῳ, πάχνη·
σοφία δ' ἴδιον, κρύσταλλος. οὐδεὶς πώποτε
ταύτην λαβὼν ἀπώλεσ'· ὦ τάλας ἐγώ,
ἐπακίστορ' ἔμαθες, ὦ πόνηρε, γράμματα·
ἀνέστροφέν σου τὸν βίον τὰ βιβλία·
πεφιλοσόφηκας γῇ τε κοὐρανῷ λαλῶν,
οἷς οὐδέν ἐστιν ἐπιμελὲς τῶν σῶν λόγων.

In a fragment from an unknown play of Phoenicides (K III 334) a courtesan who has associated successively with a soldier, a physician, and a philosopher, who tells us she was disappointed in the soldier and the physician and then gives her experience with the philosopher,

τρίτῳ συνῆψεν ἡ τύχη με φιλοσόφῳ
πώγων' ἔχοντι καὶ τρίβωνα καὶ λόγον.
οἴῳ μ' ἑταίρων φιλοσόφῳ συνῴκισεν.

εἰς πρόσωπον ἦλθον ἐπιπεσεῖν, ἢ κακόν
οὐδὲν ἐδίδου γάρ· εἰ τι δ' αἰτοίη, ἔφη
οὐκ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι τἀργύριον, εἶτ' ὦ κακόν
διὰ τοῦτο δός μοι, φεῖγον· οὐκ ἐπαύσατο

This is evidently satire called forth by the inconsistencies between the theory and the practice of members of the Stoic school. The philosophers especially the Stoics, were doubtless guilty of many things that appeared to the people to be foolishness, and it was just these peculiarities, probably more striking in a philosopher than in any one else, that formed the standard by which they were often judged. The voluntary deaths of Zeno and Cleanthes, the life led by the Cynic Crates and his eccentric wife who followed him everywhere, gave the people grounds for regarding these philosophers as abnormal specimens of humanity. It is not strange, therefore, that we find in the Thunderbolt of Anaxippus (K III 299) the following comment on the sensibleness of the philosophers in practical life.

οἴμοι, φιλοσοφεῖς. ἀλλὰ τούς γε φιλοσόφους

See Davis II

ἐν τοῖς λόγοις φρονοῦντας εὑρίσκω μόνον.

ἐν τοῖσι δ' ἔργοις ὄντας ἀνοήτους ὁρῶ

Damoxenus in a fragment from the Syntrophi (iii 347) puts into the mouth of a cook and probably his employer a conversation in which the cook and unfortunately Damoxenus himself air their knowledge of the philosophy of Democritus and Epicurus. The cook professes to have spent more than two years in the school of Epicurus, paying for the instruction that he had received the sum of ten talents. After making this statement he continues in the following strain.

ὅθεν μάγειρον ὅταν ἴδῃς ἀγράμματον
μὴ Δημόκριτόν τε πάντα διανεγνωκότα
μᾶλλον δὲ κατέχοντα [καταγέλα ὡς κενοῦ]
καὶ τὸν Ἐπικούρου κανόνα, μίνθωσας ἄφες,
ὡς ἐκ διατριβῆς. τοῦτο δεῖ γὰρ εἰδέναι,
τίν' ἔχει διαφορὰν πρῶτον, ὦ βέλτιστε σύ,
γλαυκίσκος ἐν χειμῶνι καὶ θέρει, πάλιν
ποῖος περὶ δύσιν Πλειάδος συνειδέναι

ἡδὺς ἀπὸ τροπάς τ' ἐστὶ δρυβιρώτατος.

What the character in this passage says of the absolute necessity of a cook's knowing the whole of Democritus is probably to be taken as a satire on the pretensions of the Athenian cooks at that time. Democritus had covered the whole field of philosophy and besides this had written on medicine, physiology, and mathematics. Damoxenus may have known this, he knew something about the works of Democritus, for in another part of this fragment he refers to his work on medicine. The cook in comparing his ability in the culinary art with that of inferior cooks says

παρὰ δ' ἐμοὶ τρέφει
τὸ προσφερόμενον βρῶμα καὶ λεπτύνεται
ὀρθῶς τε διαπνεῖ. τοιγαροῦν εἰς τοὺς πόρους
ὁ χυμὸς ὁμαλῶς πανταχοῦ συνίσταται.
χυμός, λέγει Δημόκριτος, οὐδεν πρᾶγμα· τὰ
γινόμενα ποιεῖ τὸν φαγόντ' ἀρθριτικόν.

β καὶ τῆς ἰατρικῆς τι μετέχειν μοι δοκεῖς.

What the cook pretends to know in reference to the fish that

were edible in different seasons of the year is similar to a statement made by a cook in a fragment from a play of Sosipater's (K III 315), and such information was probably to be found in the cookbooks of the day. Damoxenus refers this to a treatise by Democritus probably his treatise on physiology, but when he brings in the Canon of Epicurus as one of the books to be studied in preparing for the culinary profession we begin to doubt whether he knew much about the system of either of these philosophers. He doubtless knew that Epicurus' system was similar in some respects to that of Democritus, but he was not careful to find out wherein it was similar. It is hardly probable that he is trying to make the cook show his ignorance by confusing this part of Epicurus' system with the philosophy of Democritus, as it is doubtful whether the average spectator was sufficiently familiar with the two systems to detect such a blunder. If he had been familiar with the Canon of Epicurus and had wanted to include this, in addition to the whole of Democritus, in the cooks accomplishments, he would doubtless

have placed this first as an elementary matter and then have loaded the cook with the vast amount of knowledge to be obtained from the works of Democritus. But from the use that he makes of philosophy he could have had no use for this part of the system of Epicurus. He had probably heard the Canon of Epicurus often mentioned and thinking that it bore the stamp of the philosophy of Democritus, he put the two together, liking the combination but without knowing the inconsistency; or else he got the titles of the Canon and the Physics confused, as we learn from Diogenes Laertius (X 30) that it was customary to arrange the two together. This is perhaps a fair specimen of the knowledge that the comic poets had of the doctrines of the philosophers. It seems excusable in the case of the philosopher whom they preferred to all others, but they knew that he regarded pleasure as the end for which all should strive and with this they were content.

The scholiast in commenting on line 10 of the Clouds says that Eupolis devoted a whole play to the philosopher Baedas

and that the ridicule to which the philosopher was subjected was severe. Nothing besides this is known of a philosopher of this name and in the fragments left from the comedies of Diphilus no reference is made to philosophy. But the testimony of the scholiast is worthy of some consideration. He was familiar with the treatment that Hippo received at the hands of Cratinus - though he calls Cratinus Crates - and with the treatment that Socrates received from Eupolis, and we cannot conclude that his reference to Diphilus and Boidas is his own invention or that it was due to sheer ignorance. If his statement is true it will require a modification of the conclusion reached as to the treatment of the philosophers in New Comedy. But it can in any event only be regarded as an isolated case and must be attributed to a personal feeling on the part of the poet or to the peculiarities of this unknown philosopher.

It is an interesting fact to note that the two great comic poets who stand the one at the beginning and the other near the close of Greek comedy identified themselves closely

with the philosophers. Epicharmus, as we have seen, was regarded in antiquity as a Pythagorean and his writings show traces of his studies in the schools of Pythagoras and others. Menander the last great comic poet of the Greeks was a disciple of Theophrastus.[1] He was also an intimate friend of Epicurus, and this friendship seems to have been famous in antiquity. In the letter from Glycera to Menander (Alciphron II Ep. 4) Epicurus and Theophrastus are mentioned as the special friends of Menander's. If this friendship had not been well known it is not probable that Alciphron would have mentioned it here whatever may be said of his authority for the letter. In the Greek Anthology[2] we have an epigram which Menander dedicated to Epicurus along with Themistocles

χαῖρε Νεοκλείδα δίδυμον γένος, ὧν ὁ μὲν ὑμῶν
πατρίδα δουλοσύνης ῥύσαθ', ὁ δ' ἀφροσύνης.

These references leave no doubt as to Menanders attitude towards these two philosophers. His intimacy with them would have prevented an unfavorable criticism of

1) Pamphilus in Diog. Laert. I [illegible] 2) Ed. Jacobs I p. 136

their philosophy even if he had been disposed to ridicule their profession, but other philosophers were spared as well as they. He refers to the philosophers as οἱ σοφοί or οἱ τὰς ὀφρῦς αἴροντες but these were terms doubtless frequently applied to them and need have no special significance when used by Menander. He rarely refers to the philosophers except in the way just mentioned, but when he does it is with no disapprobation. The only case in which it is possible to regard what he says as ridicule is in a fragment from the Esquire (K III 72) where he mentions the Cynic Monimus.

Μόνιμός τις ἦν ἄνθρωπος ὦ Φίλων, σοφός,
ἀδοξότερος μικρῷ δ'. Β. ὁ τὴν πήραν ἔχων;
Α. πήρας μὲν οὖν τρεῖς· ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνος ῥῆμά τι
ἐφθέγξατ' οὐδὲν ἐμφερὲς μὰ τὸν Δία
τῷ γνῶθι σαυτόν, οὐδὲ τοῖς βοωμένοις
τούτοις· ὑπὲρ δὲ ταῦθ' ὁ προσαιτῶν καὶ ῥυπῶν·
τὸ γὰρ ὑποληφθὲν τῦφον εἶναι πᾶν ἔφη.

Diogenes Laertius (VI 83) does not regard this as ridicule, and even if it is to be taken as ridicule it is no more than might

have been expected from any one outside of the Cynic and Stoic schools, for people, poets, and doubtless many philosophers must have regarded the Cynics as a contemptible set. In a fragment from an unknown play (K. III 161) Menander refers to philosophy, and this is the only case in which he mentions the subject. But this is worth more than any thing else that he has left us to enable us to form an opinion as to his estimation of philosophic enquiry.

ὁ πάντα βουληθεὶς ἂν ἄνθρωπος ποιεῖν
πᾶν ἂν γένοιτο· πλούσιος τρόπον τινά,
πάλιν φιλόσοφος τινι μαθήσει χρώμενος,
τὸ σῶμ' ὑγιαίνει τινὰ δίαιταν προσφέρων·
πλὴν ἕν τι τῶν πάντων ἀδύνατον ἦν ἄρα
εὑρεῖν, δι' οὗ τρόπου τις οὐ λυπήσεται.

While this shows no decided preference so far as the poet himself is concerned, it cannot be taken as a bare reference to philosophy. It is with no sneer that he speaks of this profession here; he speaks of it rather as something to be desired. The fact that he mentions it along with

health and wealth is of itself not without some significance, and if we knew nothing of his attitude towards Epicurus and Theophrastus it would perhaps be safe to take this as a favorable comment on philosophy.

From Menanders intimacy with these philosophers and his studies under one of them we may expect his plays to abound in popular Epicurean and Peripatetic dogmas, but in this we shall be disappointed. There are no clear-cut philosophical views in his writings, but, as has been said before, it was not the business of the comic poet to reproduce any philosophy on the stage. It was only those features of this or that philosophy that had taken a firm hold upon him that would crop out here and there in his writings. In one or two [illegible] Menander seems to show kinship with Epicurus and in one, with the Peripatetics. His constant reference to pain and the desirability of being free from it may be sufficient to place him with the Epicureans. This is with him the great evil to which mortals are subject; there is not

a greater evil among men. But if this shows his Epicurean leaning, he is not an Epicurean in the popular sense. It is not the gratification of the appetites that is to be desired above everything else, it is freedom from pain. The following are two fragments preserved from unknown comedies, (K III 197).

οὐκ ἔστι λύπης, ἄν περ ὀρθῶς τις σκοπῇ,

ἀλγηρὰ μεῖζον τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώπου φύσει.

Ágam (K III 197).

πολλῶν φύσει τοῖς πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις κακῶν

ὄντων μέγιστόν ἐστιν ἡ λύπη κακόν.

In line 296 of the Monosticha we have

κρεῖττον τὸ μὴ ζῆν ἢ ζῆν ἀθλίως

In line 383, νόσον δὲ κρεῖττόν ἐστιν ἢ λύπην φέρειν

In line 414, οὐκ ἔστιν λύπης χεῖρον ἀνθρώποις κακόν.

In line 731, τὸ ζῆν ἀλύπως ἀνδρός ἐστιν εὐτυχοῦς.

In one fragment (K III 202) he probably shows kinship with Epicurus in his doctrine of the annihilation of the soul at death[1]

[1] Diog. Laert. X 2

μὴ κλαῖε τοὺς θανόντας· οὐ γὰρ ὠφελεῖ
τὰ δάκρυ' ἀναισθήτῳ γεγονότι καὶ νεκρῷ.

In two fragments he apparently reflects the doctrine of the Peripatetics in reference to one of the forces at work in the universe. In the first (K III 140) we have,

οὐ παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ τὴν πρόνοιαν αἰτίαν
κρίνων ἂν ὀρθῶς ὑπολαβεῖν τίς μοι δοκεῖ,
ἀλλ' ἔστι καὶ ταὐτόματον ἔνια χρήσιμον.

In the second (K III 82),

ταὐτόματόν ἐστιν ὡς ἔοικέ που θεός,
σῴζει τε πολλὰ τῶν ἀοράτων πραγμάτων.

Life

I was born in Union County North Carolina on the 22nd of November 18[illegible]. I entered school at the age of six and went with some irregularity until near the completion of my eighteenth year. After spending several years farming I entered school again and studied under two eminent teachers [illegible] and [illegible]. In September 18[illegible] I entered Davidson College as a Freshman. After studying here four years I received the degree of A.B. During the five years following my graduation I was engaged in teaching, first in the village of Davidson N.C. then in Mooresville N.C. and subsequently in [illegible] and [illegible]. After teaching five years I entered (in 18[illegible]) the graduate department of the Johns Hopkins University where I have studied continuously since, my subjects being [illegible].